In compliance with the
Canadian Privacy Legislation
some supporting forms
may have been removed from
this dissertation.

While these forms may be included
in the document page count,
their removal does not represent
any loss of content from the dissertation.

University of Alberta

The Aesthetic Deviance of Karen Finley

by

Kristine Nutting

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Department of Drama

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 2003

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisisitons et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 0-612-87587-3
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 0-612-87587-3

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou aturement reproduits sans son autorisation.

Canadä

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Kristine Nutting

Title of Thesis: The Aesthetic Deviance of Karen Finley

Degree: Master of Arts

Year this Degree Granted: 2003

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herein before provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The Undersigned certify that they have read, and recommended to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled *The Aesthetic deviance of Karen Finley* by Kristine Nutting in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts.

Dr Piet DeFraeye

Pr. Jan Selman

Dr. Lise Gottel

SEPT/04/03

Abstract

This thesis is an examination of Karen Finley's theatre aesthetic. Focusing on The Constant State of Desire, this work proposes that Finley utilizes deviance as a transgressive strategy in her work. The theatrical deviance of Karen Finley is explored as an artistic vehicle to discuss the simulation and propagation of late consumer culture through the concept of individual desire. Examining Karen Finley's deconstruction of cultural desire as an act of protest, this work proposes that Karen Finley's The Constant State of Desire is a moment of cultural anarchy. Running concurrently with the social critique provided by Karen Finley's work, is a critique of the education system which discusses the processes of normalization that discourage cultural dissent. The educational critique is an attempt to parallel the discussion of Finley's aesthetic deviance with an act of written performative deviance.

Dedications

For everyone who told me

"No"

"Don't"

"You can't"

Table of Contents

Introduction pg1

Chapter One: Deviance 6
An introduction to deviance and Marxism..... 6
Linguistic imperialism..... 19
Performative deviance and the NEA..... 23

Chapter Two: Feminist Theatre and Performance..... 33
An introduction to Finley's Disruption..... 33
A Brief History of Feminst Theatre's Emergence..... 38
The transgressive aesthetics of Materialist feminist theatre..... 48
a) representation
b) multiplicity
c) the gaze
d) the social pervert
Oedipalisation..... 63

Chapter Three: Desire in TCSD..... 72
The body..... 72
Psychoanalysis and patriarchal desire..... 79
Deviant and perverse desire..... 85
The myth of individual desire: the field of cultural production..... 89

Conclusion 99

INTRODUCTION

"Insert sexy quote here"
(from; the great white expanse)

I ain't no writer....that's what they say to me over and over again. "You'r not a writer Kristine". Scoff, snort, "this is definitely not writing." voice trails off...I am someone who does not know. The uknoweldgable, the unacknowledgable. And then I am drawn to think of Madame Cixous..... "Write your bodies" she calls to women to "write", as does Virginia Wolf declaring that if only we had a room of our own we would be writers...and thinkers.... and finally be able to create works of the philosophical mind, to break into the boys club as it were. Well we have rooms of our own; I have a whole house, an office in a University in fact. So why am I writing hidden away in my garage? HMMMMm. Still with houses and offices certain women are not yet writers, not in the institution of the academy, not where it 'matters' (Ockenden friend of Nutting, in garage, summer 2002, colloquial conversation). The voice of the feminine, the marginal, the voice or written word of anything that does not re-present the cultural value's of those who are in power is somehow erased, silenced or deleted.
Kristine is not a writer/rider, not an academic writer anyway..... She's too experiential.

My problem is not that I am not a writer...my problem is that I write..... it is connected to my life – life blood, bloody own way. My problem is that I am suspect of the intellectual separation between ideas and personal politics. I believe everyone is worth educating and deserves an education whether they write correctly or not. My problem is that I believe experience of all kinds is worth valuing and worth writing down. There ain't any rules to determine who is a writer and who isn't.
I do not believe that there is one way to communicate complex ideas.
I do not believe that only certain types of linear people are worthy of being academics or being educated, or being celebrated. If you write you have written and therefore in that moment, **You Are A Writer**.
I can only regurgitate the ideas of others unless I have a pen...is ?

Have you ever noticed that the word academic sounds like the word epidemic?

My notions of writing disrupt an entire hierarchical system of power. As Pierre Bourdieu points out, whoever controls the definition of writer, controls the definition of culture and therefore controls culture (of course that is naive of me to say, but my **hole** existence is naive and so forth).

Now then, writers who in fact are not writers who disregard the rules set out for them are deviant. These writers prescribe to a certain literary high jinx or cultural anarchy; therefore it is impossible for them, 'these hooligans of the learned ways', to achieve status in the academy or recognition of any kind because they are incapable of thinking in correct fashion. I just can't help wondering who defines correctness in thinking, and writing. Enter the knowledgeable and eternally powerful voice

of reason: Logic.
Huh HMMMM..... "Um you are wasting my time, will you please begin? Firstly this is some 'personal feminist wank' that I might add, makes NO sense!

I can't write...

Your way.
(Viva la revolution, even if it is impossible...)

"I start in the centre because when we are born that is where everyone starts - grounded, rooted, not encultured to be or become anything, just there existing in being. But slowly over time everything begins to shift and some of us move to the margins, because there is no space for us elsewhere. The margins always frame the centre, and in this precarious sometimes-unnoticeable position, illuminate and expose it. One cannot exist without the other"
K. Nutting

"So I put my head in the oven and nothing happened
So I fucked you all night long and nothing happened
So I went on a diet and nothing happened
So I became macrobiotic and nothing happened
So I went down to Soho and checked out the art scene and nothing happened
So I worked for the ERA and voted for Jessie Jackson and nothing happened
So I went got a student loan and went to college and nothing happened"
K. Finley

The work of Karen Finely is an intervention, an act of protest, an exercise in cultural anarchy not unlike the major anti-globalisation protests of Seattle, Genoa and Quebec. However, Finley's rebellion takes place not in the streets, but in the territory of cultural capital. Finley's theatre of protest takes aim at societal value structures that perpetuate the dis-empowerment of cultures and communities that exist on the margin of mainstream patriarchal society.

It is my belief that Finley is attempting to deconstruct for her

Introducing, MSSSSSS Karen Finley.....i can't write this. My problem my problem, my prob o lem, my pablum, my Anne Boelyn who wrote her name on the wall before she was murdered. She wrote? **again here is another break in the text.** Which is performative, commenting on both form and convention, while

audience what Louis Althussar terms ideological state apparatuses (ISA's); the invisible ideological social codes of acceptable culture and conduct which serve the already existing hierarchy of power. Althussar observes that ISA's are the social apparatuses by which hierarchical status quo agendas are perpetuated through the internalisation of those agendas' ideologically in the private social sphere's of the family, the church, friends or education.

> There is no practice except by and in ideology; there is no ideology except by the subject and for the subjects.... Ideology 'functions' in such a way that it 'recruits' subjects among the individuals (it recruits them all), or 'transforms' the individuals into subjects. (Althussar, Ed: Easthope & McGowan, 53;55.)

My interest in Karen Finley's work is a result of my interest in theatre that challenges mainstream culture via the use of taboo and its consequent provocation. However, in these modern times taboo is not enough to 'shock' an audience out of their voyeuristic complacency. In the modern age of late-consumer capitalism where the 'image has become the final form of commodity reification' (Debord, in Jameson, 197) and dissent such as the protest movements of the young are recuperated by commodity culture as another image to be purchased, the provocateur must utilise more than just a simple social taboo to decode the social codes of conduct.

manipulating space and body I should not be doing this I say coyly. It is not within the realm of accepted convention; well actually it is, as long as I keep it in the margins. This is I in the margins. It is hard to write when you no longer know what you think.
Phase one:
Inertia.
When beginning this paper/education/(my original seven thesis proposals,) I was told that I seemed to have a lot of assumptions. Therefore, I must ask what is an assumption? Assumption is defined as: 1) assuming 2) things assumed 3) reception of the Virgin Mary bodily into heaven. MMMM. The definition of assuming is: 1) *adj.* Arrogant, presumptuous. I am arrogant. What did I assume about acting, and minority culture? I observed that in acting class the

In this paper I intend to argue that Karen Finley is a performative provocateur who utilises not only taboo, but also social deviance, in order to de-familiarise the social codes of normalisation. Finley de-codes the strategies of desire in order to expose the cultural ills of modern consumerism. Finley subverts the stability of the 'real' referents of woman and desire in order to articulate the marginalised experiences of the culturally othered, the socially illegitimate. This expression of the social other is an act of dissent against the codes of social normalisation that condone the oppression of women, children, the elderly and gays and lesbians. Finley's work is about Justice (appendix ll.)

Finley's aesthetic is what I believe to be a deviant theatrical intervention in the oppression of those who exist on the margins of mainstream patriarchal interests. Finley is concerned with the black sheep of her culture, those who are referred to or implied as 'other'. Finley's integration of deviant strategies are integral to her social provocation. Finley threatens culture beyond mere taboo breaking and it is this 'threatening' that solidifies her deviant status.

In this paper I will use the text The Constant State of Desire to discuss the aesthetic deviance of Karen Finley. I will first establish deviance and its potential meanings within my own immediate culture. In my second chapter I will locate Finley within a theatrical aesthetic of deviance by

native students received lower grades because their acting was not 'good enough,' and what I saw happening was not that their acting was not good enough, it was that it was not white enough, not assimilated enough, into a signsystem of being that is based on white middle class values systems. Of course that topic proved to be well undesirable. I am a political being. We all are, to pretend that we are not, is simply that, pretend.
I assumed that a thesis was an exploration.Not an excercise based on patriarchal agenda's that ultimately serve he competitive environment of capitalism. I have been taught, not that I require another modality for learning, but that I am deviant, undisciplined, and that my desire to make art, and my need

outlining the feminist theatre theory and feminist performance tradition that Finley is a part of. Then in my third chapter I will look at Finley's use of the body and desire, and their role in deviant culture. By discussing the body, representation and desire I aspire to illuminate the cultural oppression that Finley is addressing in her work. I will conclude my findings of Finley's aesthetic deviance.

to feed myself by working while attending school is a flaw not only in my behaviour, but it is a flaw in the entity of my being. That is true, I am flawed because I cannot write without my voice and my thoughts do not exist without my voice, my breath. I have learned in my female experience, writing that is not a genuine exploration of ideas, but rather an exercise in hierarchical structures. I cannot emulate the traditional modes of education, I cannot take on the values of linear academia and succeed. I can try to do the best that I can, but this system is not set up for me. And in fact it has disabled my writing through inertia no longer trust myself enough to have a thought, or write a simple sentence.no for real. I actually was convinced i had brain damage for two years after grad

CHAPTER ONE: DEVIANCE

An introduction to Deviance and Marxism

Deviance: to deviate move away from social norms. (Concise Oxford Dictionary, 319)

What is it that defines deviance? When looking at the aforementioned definition, deviance is anything that goes against cultural norms. Therefore the word deviant is used to describe everything from breaking the law and criminal behaviour, to anarchist thought, miserable teenagers, homosexuals, or socialist thought during McCarthyism. When speaking of deviance I will be referring to deviance in relation to the roles of social conduct, excluding criminal behaviour such as theft, murder, and rape.

I would like to deal predominantly with deviant thought and othered social behaviour because the body of Karen Finley's work is centred on the experience of the cultural other. Because I am taking a materialist feminist position when interpreting Finley's performative deviance, I feel it is necessary to briefly look at Marx's analysis of social deviance. Marx's perspective on both deviance and criminal behaviour is of use for a feminist interpretation of Karen Finley's mise en scene.

According to Marx, deviant social behaviour is an "unnatural state" as it is usually a result of the alienation of the proletariat worker.

school, I am not kidding now thats funny. I am stating my experience, in this traditional education setting that 'truly' is not made for me, and so who cares so it is not made for me...big rite because it is not set up for a lot of people b4 what I find wacky is that its not set up to encourage different methodologies of learning period... This is one system under .....@#%&** When you can not possibly succeed in the desirable role, then you can begin to create a new role. I can never be the proper academic, I can never be a well-groomed young lady, I am too wild, and I don't have any respect for arbitrary rules. Voice of Logic:This has so been done before...your boring me...(*did you notice the VofL sounds like a valley girl*) KN: The only rule I believe in is the rule of

Criminal behaviour such as theft according to Marx is the workers' "un-empowered response" to capitalism's indifference to human need.

> Marx asserted that industrial capitalism degraded all areas of social life, including law, religion, politics, patriotism, even family life and sex. Essentially all social institutions reflect capitalism's indifference to human need, as shown, in the organisation of work. He said employer's commodotised labour, that is treated workers like objects or robots not humans. Hence, the dominance of commercialism, human exploitation, and financial greed play key roles in creating and perpetuating deviance and social problems. (Davis/Stazs, 30.)

Although we are no longer living in the immediacy of industrial capitalism, the symptoms of industrial capitalism that are discussed by Marx are reminiscent of the symptoms of modern consumer culture that are presented in Karen Finley's The Constant State of Desire (TCSD). TCSD can be read as an artistic response to modern consumer culture's degradation of 'social life', particularly family life and sex.

Although the capitalism that was articulated by Marx has now evolved into what is referred to as late-capitalism, in this paper I will be dealing with what I refer to as patrio-capitalism. Patrio-capitalism is the culture of modern consumerism that is buttressed by the ideologies of

safety for all human beings, if a rule is not in the interest of safety I have no interest in it. Most rules are for the control of subjects, the maintenance of obedience. Obedience to who, whooom? Why do dogs go to obedience school? So they can obey the will of their master. me.We have no student's only teachers thats what my mom always says. Duality, we are all both; we are male and female, smart and ignorant, logical and illogical; so why do we spend so much time creating systems that are based on drawing lines between ourselves. Why is it if I say such a thing it is naive and flakey,why is it better if I deconstruct a binary narrative? because honestly a lot of our hearts are so god damn hard we use a little flakiness, and why is that so threatening, and horrific to our so

patriarchy. I will deal with capitalism in this way because this particular work is not an in depth analysis of post-modern capitalism, rather it is an examination into a specific artwork of a feminist performance artist whose art presents a "feminist post-modern critique" of current consumer culture (Pramagiorre, 272).

Finley's critique of consumer culture in TCSD indicates a symbiotic merging of capitalism with patriarchal ideologies. How then do these ideologies degrade the areas of social life, creating the response of 'deviance'?

The ideologies of capitalism and patriarchy enter the realm of the subject by their insinuation into the private sphere (family, religion and literature) and affirming the ideologies of the private with the public structures of social governance and normalisation. In the culture of patrio-capitalism the female subject becomes the commodified object via her relations with desire, and the 'degraded' (reduced to commodified value) areas of private life that are in turn affirmed by mainstream culture, the public world of business enterprise, religion and education. The female enters the realm of deviant social behaviour if she rejects the role femininity that is set out for her through cultural normalisation. These roles have grown over the years, where at one time it was only acceptable for women to be teachers or nurses, it is now acceptable for women to enter almost all

sophisticated selves. Why is flakey synonymous with ignorance, and distaste. feminists that are of good intellectual standing, get on that ol' boy band wagon in order to play the power game and assert the tenacity of their powerful logic. Why is the academic environment based on a harsh calculating objectivity that is devoid of human flaw or compassion, an objectivity that is impossible anyway, and why is compassion and or passion thought of as a flaw when it comes to academia or the pursuit of learning? This is capitalism's playground.. where the system is replicated over and over again, whoever is the best can have the most power. Our childhood games my mother punched your mother right in the nose, you are not it. He wins. I am assuming all

fields of occupation. However women and men are still subject to cultural normalisation that is dependent upon the social performance of gender which is informed by the ideologies of both capitalism and patriarchy simultaneously. Therefore, in Finley's work (TCSD) the exploration of deviance is a lucrative excursion in the examination of post-modern culture's tendency to commodify and assimilate resistance to social norms.

The social deviance that is discussed by Marx is relative to a social economy that is disinterested in the well being its people. Marx argues that the worker, alienated from his work, his sense of brotherhood and his needs reacts to his dissempowerement by socially perceived deviant acts such as theft or rape or murder. However, deviant acts such as theft or murder can be interpreted as the worker's retaliation against an alienating culture where dollar market value can be placed on human life and experience, and women are expendable objects. Finley's art in the late eighties and early nineties was condemned in the mainstream press as deviant. In fact she lost her grant funding as a result of her deviant status. Because Marx argues that social deviance is the 'workers' retaliation against an alienating culture, when Finley's indecent media status is aligned with Marx's theory on deviance it may be argued that Finley's artistic 'deviance' is an empowered response to normalised social culture.

Finley's mise en scene, particularly in The Constant State of Desire,

of this, these are my assumptions, this is what I really think and it is taboo, passé, been done, boring, and derivative to include my own experience in an academic analysis. This is my arrogance, my bodily virgin Mary into heaven. Father forgive I have sinned, I do take things to be true. I assume that some things I just know, just because they are, because of what they do to me viscerally. My child you are not forgiven write one hundred pages on Karen Finley and your penance will be done... ..... I got shivers the first time I saw her rant against capitalism into a microphone. I got shivers the first time I was told no, when I was told that I would not be allowed to work on drama pedagogy and minority cultures, it was too general, did not make....What if tampons were

is focussed around the 'dominance of commercialism' and 'financial greed' as it pertains to the hierarchical system of patriarchy and its subsequent misogyny. Because I propose to outline Finley's theatrical framing as an aesthetic of subversive deviance, I would like to outline some of the potential cultural implications of the word deviant. To examine how the word 'deviance' and or deviant behaviour collects and diffuses meaning within the framework of socio-cultural capital in relation to 'othered' culture. Deviance theory illuminates social codes of acceptable behaviour and is integral to the reception of Karen Finley's subversive Performance.

microphones what a different world it would be, Insert tampon here... IT IS NOT THAT I DO NOT MAKE SENSE IT IS THAT YOU ARE THREATENED BY MY THESIS WORK POLITICALLY!! YOU ARE AFRAID YOU WILL BE EXPOSED! YOU ARE THE ONE WHO DOES NOT MAKE SENSE, WHEN IS THE LAST TIME YOU PICKED UP A BOOK THAT WASN'T WRITTEN BY A FAT OLD DEAD WHITE GUY ANYWAY???I slowly begin to put the tampon down but the blood trailing from its end says YES I AM DISTURBED! I AM A DISTURBED WOMAN, AND THIS IS ME ACTING OUT!! And because I am young and twenty six and do not construct myself the way

The Deviant In Your Neighbourhood

The word 'deviant' enters culture via a system of representation or cultural memes that expand through systems of cultural meaning much like a virus; hence, the word deviant often carries with it through this viral system of meaning a resonance of something that is wicked by nature. The meaning of deviance then goes beyond a mere descriptor for behaviour but rather becomes entwined with the ethereal make-up of entity. H. Taylor Buckner notes the phenomenon of the 'deviant' descriptor evolution to undesirable character essence in his study on deviance, Deviance, Reality and Change. Buckner observes,

> In the late 1940s and early 1950s the term 'deviance' began to be

substituted for 'social pathology'. Introducing a supposedly value-free word with more general definition broadened the area of interest, since now all behaviour that deviated from the social norm could be studied... Regardless of the tradition followed - looking at the deviant as a defective person, or looking at the process through which he came to be called deviant - the word itself is negative. Would you like to marry a deviant? Would you feel comfortable eating lunch with a deviant? The word denotes a person who has varied form the normal. And connotes that this is bad. To call someone deviant is to call him abnormal and bad, whether we are sociologists or laymen. (Buckner, 4-5)

Buckner's illustration of deviance transcending behavioural descriptor to defective personality trait is also observed in the catholic church's use of the word deviant to describe not only the homosexual act, but also the entirety of the homosexual personage. The word deviant stigmatises difference in the community, colouring difference as wicked, negative, and somehow related to an imperfect origin in the 'deviant's' genetic make-up (Davis/Staz, 65). I believe that this is not a co-incidence, as deviation from societal norms are frequently perceived as a rejection of the existing hierarchy of social order. Therefore, deviance and its plausible rebellion will not be socially rewarded. Consequently, I am left to wonder what

you think an academic twenty six year old WOMAN should I have no power that you respect so rather than consider my feminist Marxist approach to drama education pedagogy, shopping whatever, I will be dismissed as someone who does not make sense, who cannot write....my voice trails off and I put the tampon away. Perhaps lets just say perhaps that is so. I admit it I cannot write. Not here anyway. A wise man once said...and probably was told by a wise woman before that, and she was told by her black maid before that, that writers block is not the writer being blocked it occurs from the writer not writing the truth. Perhaps it is not that I cannot write, perhaps it is just that I cannot write the agendas of this institution, and because I cannot write my truth

happens when a person disagrees with the social norms of family, the corporate capitalist economic agenda, or the various manifestations of western consumerism? Does their community then perceive them as deviant? And if so, are they truly deviant? How does the social structure handle and or create this deviance?

Deviance is perceived culturally as negative because it streams away from the cultural 'norm'. The norm as Marx suggests is wrapped up in methodologies of social control, such as morality, family and religion, all of which are structured to perpetuate the workers/labourers/masses from rebelling against the existing social hierarchies. Accordingly, the worker/citizen becomes alienated from their sense of self as their participation in family-life and society as a whole becomes ensconced in dominant ideologies, (in Finley's case the dominant ideologies surrounding American consumer culture). Therefore dominant cultural ideologies are internalised via ideological state apparatuses, thus resulting in the pursuit of 'the path of least social resistance' (Davis and Staz). The desire to stay in favour with the community of job, family, friends, church and policing system is more lucrative than the potential punishment or social renunciation that may result from questioning the ownership of property, or resisting the purchasing of goods produced by child slave labour.

Mass incompetence may follow the extensive use of specialised and

here, my writing is getting more and more muttled,confused and silenced under a circular logic that spins inward on itself searching for a grounding so far inward that it disappears. I have internalised the truth of this institution. I did. Not any more. This is my ritual. I will set myself free. .Why do I participate in the ritual of paper writing? I feel that in order to be allowed the permission to write a paper I must 'know'. Nietzsche says that to Know is merely to work with one's favourite metaphors. Metaphors are the language of the soul, so says James Hillman. Fuck the metaphor! I know bullshit when I smell it.
****
Virginia wolf
Was a wolf like no other, wolf, who wolfed down the big bad wolf in one wolf bite.rite. right?write. to write is to

> invariable distorted political language. This ignorance grows when people begin to believe that only the experts really know what is good for them. They let official messages carry more impact than personal experience and reject truthful confrontations as antisocial. In the extreme, conflict becomes heresy or treason... Power and ideology then forms an interrelated whole. Elites work through a power structure accomplished through political, economic, and cultural control over the means of production and communication. The power knowledge unity implies that rather than through genuine consensus, based on citizens' real interests and needs, modern society often operates by stifling opposition at its roots, by defining what the total social authority calls normal and natural. (Davis/Stasz, 66-67).

Consequently, deviance and or difference from the cultural mean of normalcy are stigmatised within social ideology and apparatuses. This stigmatisation of difference is then reinforced via media, technology, and the specialised 'political language' of distortion.

At this time it would be then beneficial to look at how distorted political language may function within a fictional suburban community; successively examining how that "control talk" is then transferred into an ideology of normalcy that enables a silent culture of torture and violence.

rebel, to write my secret incorrect words, to write my silence, silenced by sentences that say YOU DO NOT MAKE SENSE...You LACK THE ACADEMIC RIGOUR TO WRITE, YOU CANNOT WRITE.....tell me I can't and I will.To write is an act of rebellion, Virginia Wolf virgin saint forgive me for I have sinned. I am a deviant, a writer in the closet. Someone said to me in this institution that I had to learn that there are rules, that I can't just ho around being creative without rules. And my question is why? Whose rules? What if I am a creative person? The government doesn't follow rules,or if they do they' re totally perverse. Like the guidelines of the WTO or the G8. Set up to serve third world countries, (she says with sarcasm) corrupt serve the agenda

invariable distorted political language. This ignorance grows when people begin to believe that only the experts really know what is good for them. They let official messages carry more impact than personal experience and reject truthful confrontations as antisocial. In the extreme, conflict becomes heresy or treason... Power and ideology then forms an interrelated whole. Elites work through a power structure accomplished through political, economic, and cultural control over the means of production and communication. The power knowledge unity implies that rather than through genuine consensus, based on citizens' real interests and needs, modern society often operates by stifling opposition at its roots, by defining what the total social authority calls normal and natural. (Davis/Stasz, 66-67).

Consequently, deviance and or difference from the cultural mean of normalcy are stigmatised within social ideology and apparatuses. This stigmatisation of difference is then reinforced via media, technology, and the specialised 'political language' of distortion.

At this time it would be then beneficial to look at how distorted political language may function within a fictional suburban community; successively examining how that "control talk" is then transferred into an ideology of normalcy that enables a silent culture of torture and violence.

rebel, to write my secret incorrect words, to write my silence, silenced by sentences that say YOU DO NOT MAKE SENSE...You LACK THE ACADEMIC RIGOUR TO WRITE, YOU CANNOT WRITE.....tell me I can't and I will.To write is an act of rebellion, Virginia Wolf virgin saint forgive me for I have sinned. I am a deviant, a writer in the closet. Someone said to me in this institution that I had to learn that there are rules, that I can't just ho around being creative without rules. And my question is why? Whose rules? What if I am a creative person? The government doesn't follow rules,or if they do they' re totally perverse. Like the guidelines of the WTO or the G8. Set up to serve third world countries, (she says with sarcasm) corrupt serve the agenda

For example, social and moral codes in a fictional western suburb would not support the murder of a human, or a beating of a child, nor the targeted starvation of one's neighbours. Yet this moral discrepancy occurs via 'mass incompetence due to specialised political language'. The example I will use is the political language and mediatization surrounding international Free Trade agreements.

The word trade itself means that one party of their free will gives/trades something in exchange for something else. Inherent in this exchange is the assumption that the trade will be of equal benefit to each trading party. However, in free trade agreements the trade is costly to the third world party who does not really have a choice in the matter. The practices of such free trade engage in labour practices unacceptable here in the western world's code of moral and social values, yet this 'distorted political language' (ibid.) makes third world human rights violations not only acceptable but a preferred economic practice worthy of the common citizen's support. To resist mainstream economic consumerist theory in the western suburb may result in alienation from one's neighbours, co-workers, children or family, and perhaps even the loss of one's job. Suppose the common citizen begins to expose the distorted political language of their community, telling his/her neighbours that the gas they put in their car from Shell comes from the murder of Ken Sirowewa, and that the diamond on

of The USA...ok maybe canada and europe, but the rules of trade certainly do not actually help any of the people they are supposed to be for. So I have learned that there are rules and that they are not interested in human kind, they are interested in breurocracy and profit, they are not based in human connections, and I am choosing a different life for myself, so I have learned that there are rules, and they are not for me. Funny that so long after Virginia Wolf wrote about Shakespeare's sister and all her ills I find myself still stifled by the same rules although those rules are more covert now. I am pregnant with illegitimacy. I am moral discrepancy, a mass of incompetence*** process changes from day to day..today I am stuck, somehow this paper is not simply about regurgitation of

their neighbour's engagement ring is only made possible by their complacency in the murders of the peoples of Siera Leone. The citizen becomes threatening within their community, for who wants to hear, "Hi neighbour, did you know that you are complacent in the child beatings that occurred to make your clothing?" instead of, "Hi Neighbour, you look great today".

The citizen soon can become known in their community as the neighbourhood 'loony', their political deconstruction of what is perceived as normal in the community is slowly stigmatised as negative. The dissenting neighbour is banished indirectly through the subtle rejections and ostracization of their community. The dissenter perhaps becomes labelled in the community, they become known as left wing, naive or fanatical. This 'left wing' or 'radical' status somehow obtains a derogatory meaning that is other than normal, other than natural, therefore not to be trusted.

As it stands, my fictional suburban citizen is alienated from their fellow neighbours, perhaps their children begin to suffer as they are teased at school, consequently the family begins to pressure the citizen to stop her dissent. Thus, the ideological thought life of the citizen that is different from the cultural norm is stigmatised, as pressure mounts from the community, and family. Further pressure may mount if the dissenter's food supply is threatened due to dismissal from their job because of their

Feminist theory and Finley. I know Finley, this is bigger..it is pure fear, it is the symbolic act of challenging and engaging in something that wishes me out, something that demands I submit and take on anothers naming of myself..to be named by the other is traumatic, so says Judith Butler, whatever We all knew that in grade one.This is my writing of the perverse, the pathetic...the black sludge that I must move through, this is me engaging in western logos, and it unearths me..'knock me down put me in my place. Down of the ground the ground is a good place'. the fear is creeping in my writ... The voice "You are a fraud. There is no room for you in this tradition." I am a fraud, so what. I am the illogical feminine.
This is my all too feminine writing. Why is this so negative, why is feminine writing

'radical' belief system.

> Dominant institutions, such as the state, economy, media, education, medicine, and others may ignore, deny, or eradicate conflict and diversity...Another standard tactic is to stigmatise differences as deviant. (Davis and Staz, 65).

The example of the dissenting citizen of course is extreme however it is accurate in its fictional outline of cultural apparatuses that engage in maintaining already established hierarchies of power through cultural obedience and complacency. As Foucault points out,

> The new methods of power are not ensured by right but by technique, not by law but by normalisation, not by punishment but by control, methods that are employed on all levels and in forms that go beyond the state and its apparatuses. (Fillingham, 141)

Therefore, the example of the dissenting citizen begs the question: if ideology and power are interlinked to form a cohesive whole, and difference and hegemonic opposition "are stifled at their roots" (Davis and Stasz, 67) by social normalisation, how does the citizen express dissent? Moreover, if the hegemonic consumer culture manufactures social and cultural production, and that hegemony is 'embodied' within its ideological subjects by the fraudulent representations of individuals and the "imaginary relationships" they have to their "real material conditions" (Gramsci, in

soooo taboo? Why is there no space for this writing ? Why am I writing in my garage? This proper thinking. THIS IS NOT MY VOICE!!! Why is there no room for my voice in my own education that I have paid over forty fucking thousand dollars for...so that I can correct my 'bad' behaviour'. Coerce myself out of speaking my truth. Why is my own education about silencing me, instead of freeing me? Is this not the intent of education, to enrich the public, to give them options to free them from oppression? My options: be a charming waitress? Dear father god I promise to serve, serve my Cunt tree, Serve, serve...serve tables?Serve the hierarchy of language, I guess they are the same no? Instead of serving up plates of white bread and white pasta

Davis and Staz, 67) how may marginalised citizens (such as women, homosexuals or people of colour), or the socially deviant, legitimately challenge the presumed democratic hegemony that is said to represent their needs?

Deviance is often delineated by its participation in social taboo. However, it is important to note that taboo is also socially constructed and therefore often what is culturally taboo, is what is most threatening to the structures of hegemonic power. It is the role of the provocateur to be deviant, and in that deviance they may reclaim or redefine the social production by which their deviance was created. As Davis and Staz state,

> Power and Ideology (then) form and interrelated whole. Elites work through a power structure accomplished through political, economic, and cultural control over the means of production and communication. The power/knowledge unity implies that rather than through genuine consensus, based on the citizens real interests and needs, modern society often operates by stifling opposition at its roots, by defining what is normal and natural.
>
> (Davis and Stasz, 66-67)

If I am to use Davis and Stasz's illustration of truthful confrontations against distorted political language or control talk as a methodology of social insurrection, then Karen Finley is the priestess of

with white sugar for ever fattened white woe/mens, I will serve up white words, white agenda's, with good common white sense and white logic. I will swallow my own thoughts, feelings and being for five bucks an hour, a sessional contract, and a subtle pinch in the ass, and If I am a good girl, and dress nice and act pretty I can maybe get sexually harassed or ogled by fat slobbering old men, or I can be silently disdained by other nice ladies as we compete for the few positions that are reserved for 'good girls' at the top. Me and the other ladies can tear each other to shreds on our way up the waitressing, corporate, tenure tracked ladder, because that's what we are taught to do. We can spout off about femin-ism and the like, but we will not internalise those values because they will not

high treason. That is to say, her performance is anti-social, as it seeks to expose the control talk of her immediate culture, and consequently begins to deconstruct the ideological state apparatuses of family, religion and government. Finley, who believes her culture of misogyny to be culture of terror, is terrorising back. As she says herself with no apologies she is "the queen of the dung dynasty" (Finley, Ed: Martin, 296), she seeks not to be a part of what is normal and natural, for from Finley's performance it becomes apparent that she believes what is coined normal and natural in a misogynist culture is deviant, violent, and anti- social.

The deviant provocateur (Karen Finley in this case) attempts a cultural mutiny. The cultural upheaval that Finley is attempting cannot translate across the theatrical representation of taboo: deviance is integral to Finley's provocation. In fact, it is Finley's use of taboo, and her undoing of social codes of conduct that secures her status as deviant. Karen Finley 'undoes' her western patrio-capitalism's cultural encoding by engaging in that which is stigmatised by her culture as deviant. When something is deviant it may be easily dismissed by mainstream culture. What is of interest here is although deviance may be dismissed, it may also be a tool to expose cultural hegemony. That which is regarded deviant by normalisation, reveals the nature of normalisation itself, and thereby illuminates the moral discrepancies within normalisation, particularly when

provide us with power, or money, nor will those feminist/social justice values we read about in texts silence the subtle hatred of ourselves. "Would you like fries for those testicles in your mouth or just a side of Caesar salad?" I will be a nice girl if I wear a little more make-up, dress more seriously, act dumb... Then I can become a master. A master of fraudulence. Place audible scream here! I do not have to dress like a nice girl, or preface each statement with a maybe in order to be heard, in order to be educated women defer themselves to whoever else may be in the room, and the male students, they just speak. In the year 2003 this still happens and in fact is the predominate interaction of females and males in the classroom. I have no stats, to prove this. I just know this cuz I see it every fucking

it is brought to the performative realm of representation. To perform deviance is to perform an act of terrorism upon our binary structured culture; it is the performance of linguistic imperialism.

time I teach. And so what, I say. Gee its good terms like patriarchy and capitalism are outmoded. I am a bad girl ...I just speak, I have not learned to defer properly! I yell and scream, and cause trouble. I am difficult-which makes me think of Foucault and his analysis of the female patients in the early mental institutions. Ofcourse these women insisted they were not crazy, that in fact they did not want to do what they were told, but unless they were obedient, they would not be allowed to leave the institution. Apparently I will not be set free from graduate school until I submit, until I write like the male hierarchy of education demands that I must. Even though there are new methodologies of learning that clearly illustrate there are many ways to write,

Linguistic Imperialism

How does one perform the imperialism of language? Language orders the western world, we think in language. Consequently, nothing can exist apart from ideology. That is to say, we order our world symbolically, and that symbolic order is constructed via languages incipient hierarchy. Jeanie Forte observes the phenomenon of intrinsic patriarchal agenda in 'sense making' apparatuses. "For Lacan" observes Forte,

> The symbolic order, [is]a linguistically encoded network of meaning and signification that is internalised with the acquisition of language; and which Lacan sums up as the Name-of- the-Father, recognising the inherent patriarchy. (Forte, Ed: Case, 255)

This linguistic patriarchal ordering is referred to as Phallologocentricism. Therefore, as Elin Diamond notes, the "phallic signifier organises the production of meaning" (Diamond, 59). In order to decode linguistic hierarchy one must investigate the binary value system of language.

As Helene Cixous illustrates in her article Sorties, meaning and culture strategically devalue the feminine and reward the masculine.

Cixous writes,

> Always the same metaphor; we follow it, it carries us.... wherever discourse is organised. Logocentricism subjects thought - all concepts, codes and values - to a binary system, related to the couple, man/woman...Organisation by hierarchy makes all conceptual organisation subject to man...which he uses to sustain himself. (Cixous, Ed: Easthope & McGowan, 146 -147)

Symbolic ordering and sense making is based upon a logos that favours the masculine and insists upon a dubious separation and hierarchical organisation of masculine and feminine.

To destabilise binary logic distinctions through the iconography of deviance is to perform an act of cultural anarchy. That is to say, the rejection of binary ordering results in an upheaval of the western logos. When discussing such binary terrorism Rebecca Schnieder observes ,

> The terror that accompanies the dissolution of a binary habit sense-making and self-fashioning is directly proportionate to the social safety insured in the maintenance of such apparatus of sense. The rigidity of our social binaries – male/female, white/black, civilised/primitive, art/porn - are sacred to our Western cultural ways of knowing, and theorists have long pointed to the necessity of interrogating such foundational distinctions to discover precisely

non-linear, feminist, post-modern, multiplicitous schizoid writing, the un-logic, the writing of things anti-oedipal. This is deviance. Write here. Place Silent Scream here. everything is trapped in my throat, in my head. I live in my heart...but academia's goal is to eliminate the heart, as though we all dont have one, as though it does not impact our world, our learning our understanding. We must alienate our hearts to be OBJEctive, (even though we all know there is know such thing) and efficient. We all live in our hearts yes? Our guts No?Why must they be eliminated from the learning process? We can read about them (hearts, thoughts and feelings), but god/dean/master forbid if we admit having them ourselves We will pack away these trite and quaint little

how they bolster the social network as a whole, precisely what they uphold and what they exclude. (Schneider, 13)

To challenge the binary based logocentrism of western culture is to challenge traditional 'ways of knowing'. Therefore the social hierarchy of meaning and cultural production are no longer stabilised systems of order and truth: they become fluid, fleeting organisations of favoured cultural representation.

Performative deviance may allow for the undoing of social codes as it rejects good/bad binary value systems, and calls into question the binary sense-making apparatuses. To perform deviance is to perform the 'binary terror' Schnieder is speaking of; in so far as, the sense making apparatus of language, logic and representation are called into question when the 'favourable' side of the binary is rejected by the absence of its performance, and the absence of the desire to perform the culturally accepted binary behaviour.

Our binary-based culture is performed and created for the positive side of the binary: society rewards the positive side of binary apparatuses, which serve the ideological agenda of the existing hierarchy. Because culture is itself performative, our social identities are created performatively (we are always performing ourselves). Whether we are performing our gender, or our social status, we are performing where we

hearts, these naive little notions that education must be a gestalt, because we live in a schizoid gestalt that exists on many levels all at once. If our bodies(hearts) were not necessary for our education and experience in life we would just have heads. Cut off their bodies, the dean cry's as each new student comes in. The dean smiles and the students quickly forget that it was ever any different. Slowly eating the flesh of one another we manage to internalise, the logic of the father, dismissing the noises that are made from our very centers,our digestive tracks as they reject the eating of ourselves. Pay no mind, just mind. Mind your eye on the ball, that bouncing ball and ye shall succeeeed. "I cannot write without my voice," she says for the fifteenth

are situated in relation to cultural binary linguistics. Therefore how we perform in culture determines how we will be rewarded in our ability to get a job, enter elite systems of education, make friends or business connections.

Oedipus is an excellent example of positive binary reward. Deluze and Guitari link the oedipal story to the social structures of power and the hegemony of capitalist culture. Deluze and Guitari observe, "Oedipus informs us: if you don't follow the lines of differentiation daddy- mommy- me.... You will fall into the black night of the undifferentiated" (D&G, in Shannon Bell, 37). According to Deluze and Guitari 'The black night of the undifferentiated' is the place that exists outside of binary ordered culture. Therefore, as Oedipus strays from the symbolic order of his Kingdom (killing his father, and seducing his mother) he is punished accordingly, the order of the father/society is restored through Oedipus's shame and punishment. Oedipus is the social symbol of the impending chaos and punishment that is incurred if the Law of the Father or social codes of acceptance are not obeyed. Therefore, when the deviant and or negative side of the linguistic logic is performed without mimetic representation, or allegorical punishment; it resists the desire to create symbolic order. By resisting the emulation of the positive (patriarchal) binary, deviance rejects unifying notions such as universality or duality, or

time, I wonder what she's getting at? "I cannot write without my creativity," now the broad thinks she's creative. "I cannot write without passion." 'Kristine You are too passionate' that's what they say, whats wrong with passion? Why are ideas less valid if they are impassioned? IS it because then they are aligned with the feminine, the ever present ever threatening feminine part of languages binary.It snot logical or correct. Who says that logic is correct in the first place? Whose logic, the logic of my father, my father the judiciary, the judge who is in charge of maintaining social order in a way that is subtle and suggests a 'punitive city under the guise o' freedom?' There will be no difference in this punitive city. This is our home.Our punitive city is our school. The

oedipal psycho-social constraints that justify inequalities in logos, meaning and culture. Deviance and its unapologetic representation assert the culture of other as something to be considered, while simultaneously interrogating the foundations that devalue that which occupies the status of 'other', 'undesirable' or 'deviant'.

Accordingly, deviance may be used in performance aesthetic as a subversive tool for the deconstruction of ideological apparatuses of family, religion, education and government. Deviance and its mimetic resistance may incite provocation and create the deconstruction of ordered culture and its apparatuses, not only in the liminal, but also in the post-liminal realm of the theatre ritual. Such is the example provided by Karen Finley's conflict with the Nea.

Performative Deviance And The NEA

In the article 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses', Louis Althussar suggests that the nature of the ideological state apparatus is different from that of the repressive state apparatus, the latter being tied closely with physical repression while former being linked strictly with ideology. According to Althussar, ISA's function ideologically in the social structures of politics, family, religion, law, education, culture such as art, Literature and communication (Althussar, Easthope & McGowan, 50).

logic of the law, the logic of the father that is based on the ideological coercion of society? In order for me to be a good student and complete a masters thesis, I must be devoid of passion and learn to perform tasks through a series of behaviour modification systems. At the end of this process I will be a desired master, something that is transferable to another institution or will contribute to the continuation of this institutions agenda either via the ideology of teaching, or entering the work force with my 'nice' behaviour modifications. Foucault perhaps describes this best in his analysis of the prison institution. am I comparing graduate school to the autonomous punitive prison? Yes, because really Foucault did this first, and when I look at Foucault's

Although I think that Karen Finley's work The Constant State of Desire is commenting on political, familial, religious and educational ISA's, I would like to focus at this point on what I believe to be the result of Karen Finley's deviant mimetic resistance and the cultural upheaval that occurred as a result of her deconstruction of the symbolic order.

Karen Finley's theatre is often interpreted via the iconography of her media persona. Finley became famous most notably not for her theatre as such but for her fight to protect the integrity of grant funding from the NEA for artists that are working outside of the cultural norm. Finley has commented on the reception of her work in relation to the NEA battle as limiting, and frustrating at best, as her artwork is often overlooked in favour of the controversy surrounding the funding of that work. (Carr, www.villagevoice.com)

I will not delve deeply into the details of the NEA battle for this work. Nor will I focus on the consequent reception of Karen Finley's work in specific relation to the first amendment controversy. Audience reception of Finley surrounding the NEA funding controversies is not the focus of this work. Although audience reception and theatrical framing devices are interlinked, the NEA controversy veers off into other territory, such as human rights issues, and censorship. This work's goal is to focus on the theatrical aesthetic of creative deviance in her work. However, I will

writings I begin to see that the onset of the prison system is aligned with the history and the evolution of the educational institution. The goal of the prison system is to form obedient subjects, so to is the goal of the education system. The history of the student/teacher relationship is based upon a history of power. The teacher is the autonomous power holder who is not to physically enforce his power upon his student, but rather the student is moulded into an obedient subject who will internalise the authority and power of the teacher and consequently the institution. In education if the student does not internalise the knowledge(val ue based) offer-ed in *correct fashion* the student will be punished (silently not publicly) through the mark that she

engage in a brief overview of the NEA court case, as what are illustrated in the NEA battle are the normalisation apparatuses that maintain definitions of deviance and decency.

The NEA controversy involved the 'NEA four': four artists who produced artistic works that centred around marginalised or othered culture. More specifically these works all dealt with gay culture, and or nudity and also adhered to multiplicitous methodologies of art making; these artists utilised unconventional artistic aesthetics. The artists were Tim Miller, Karen Finley, Holly Hughes, and John Fleck. These four artists contested the decision of the National Endowment for the Arts to withdraw their funding. The NEA denied funding to the 'Nea Four' as a direct result of a new ruling by congress for outlining "procedures for judging grant applications", (bill 954(d) (1)). The NEA four argued that their works were refused funding because of the refuted decency clause. The clause states;

> the chairperson(s) must take into consideration general standards of decency and respect for diverse beliefs and values.
>
> (http//www.csulb.edu/~jvancamp/doc7/htm)

The artists believed that their funding was cut because they were creating art that did not represent the value systems of mainstream hetro-christian capitalist culture, consequently they were being denied their funding due to

receives. This mark will then be internalised as a value judgement on that student(as though it is possible to quantitatively value a human by assigning numerical form to existence), I am a six, six is average. That student could end up being a six simply because the teacher was very poor as child and hates to be reminded of being poor and hates to be reminded of the ignorance, hairstyle, personality type of her uneducated mother, so that is transferred onto the student who is unkempt or has no cultural capital. The student who does not get read to at home becomes ignorant, a slow learner or perhaps just average. The young student then gradually takes on this identification of '5" or slow learner that really stems from the competitive value attributed

their alternative belief systems and lifestyles: they believed their work was being censored and that the bill was taking away artistic freedoms. The conflict went all the way to the Supreme Court.

> Plaintiffs Finley, Fleck, Hughes, Miller, refused fellowships under the defendant National Endowment for the Arts solo performance artists program. They, (the Nea Four as they came to be known) filed suit, alleging, among other things, that a provision of the NEA's governing statute identifying the standard for approval of funding applications violated the Fifth and First Amendments because it was impermissibly vague and imposed content-based restrictions on protected speech. The district court agreed, granted summary judgement to the plaintiffs, and certified its ruling for interlocutory and appeal. Finley v. National Endowment for the Arts, 795 F. Supp. 1457 (C.D cal 1992)
>
> (http, Ibid.)

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in Los Angeles decided in favour of the NEA Four in 1993, and reconciliatory packages were given that exceeded the original funding withdrawn from the artists. However, the decency clause decision would be overturned in the Supreme Court and art funding would be assessed according to cultural value judgements.

The NEA controversy and the provocative art of Finley, Miller,

nature of capitalism that actually does assign value to human life. the value of a human life in the third world is clearly not worth as much as the value of a human life in the western world, those values also decrease accordingly via race, wealth and gender. So then this marked student travels through her life with her slow acceptance of herself as average or ignorant & so forth,then future educational experiences result in similar marks as the students identity has been slowly moulded around the agenda of the institution, via reward and behaviour modification through the apparatus of marking and or punishment. Value judegments are internalised as outside/job/ financial opportunities are received or denied accordi

Fleck, & Hughes began a fundamental dialogue on the nature of art and the freedom of speech for minority viewpoints, and the responsibility of the government and the political social structures of law to support diversity in art and culture, through funding and venue provision.

The NEA's, decency clause is a provocative site of conflict, because what is at stake is the power to control the production of culture through the elimination of artistic dissent, via the removal of financial means necessary to create divergent works of art. If the funding of art is left to the arbitrary value of decency, art which is provocative or aligned in othered culture will be silenced: The values of mainstream culture are not vested in the interests of minority or alternative culture, particularly if that culture is viewed by the majority of taxpaying citizens as 'deviant', such as homosexuality.

The decency clause was proved vague, and fell subject to the 'void-for-vagueness' law, in which it is necessary to make standards or statute's visible to the citizen in order that the citizen (being an individual of free will) may act accordingly within the framework of those laws. Therefore, government agency must make clear regulations that lend themselves to subjective or arbitrary decisions that may in fact be discriminatory.

The 'decency and respect' provision authorises viewpoint discrimination, and 'egregious form of content discrimination'.

ngly.The intent of an educational institution is to reform the unlearned subject into a learned one. Power informs knowledge, and knowledge is distributed amongst the methodologies/ideologiues of power. The roles are Admin, teacher /student, we each must not usurp our roles. This system must be profitable. Profitable??? Learning must be profitable. Ofcourse this naturally begs the questions, whose learning however, this crucial question never enters the agenda of school boards or curriculum agenda's. If I resist the writing methodology of linear narrative supported by already existing facts illustrated via the act of proper citations that clearly state "I did not think for myself and of course this is someone else's idea, I dare not think for myself',

> Because the government has made no attempt to articulate a compelling interest served by the provision, (23) Sec. 954 (d) (1) cannot survive strict scrutiny.
>
> (Court documentation, http://www.csulb.edu~jvancamp/doc7.htm)

Public outcry erupted from many right wing religious groups in response to the NEA supported artworks that were considered offensive. These coalitions that were mostly Christian oriented, believed that the government need not spend tax dollars funding what the general public viewed as indecent. Artists argued that the government would be putting constraints on artistic expression by limiting funding to those who were deemed socially acceptable. Congress sided with the public outcry against obscene and pornographic art, arguing that they were not taking away the artist's freedom of speech, and therefore they were not imposing censorship, as the artists were free to make whatever art they desired. However, Congress restricts the actions of artists through the funding controls of the NEA.

> This case is about whether the American people can require a government agency to consider, in giving grants to very few of the many artist in the country, 'general standards of decency' and respect for the diverse beliefs and values of the American public (Court documentation, Ibid.).

written with the grammatical rules set by the gran-daddies of the english language, if I resist this, I will fail. I am not allowed to enter the culture of education **cunt** first, I must have it hidden along with my passion and heart. I will be pushed out of the system through the filtration of marking, and or criticism that is aligned with the entirety of my make-up, such as 'I do not make sense', I 'lack academic rigour', 'I am not a writer', or I belong in kindergarten and so forth. All of these assertions suggest that I must in some way be corrected, not that the teachers who assert that I do not make sense are unfamiliar with what I am saying, due to their attachment to their current ideologies that support the status quo. I think in a process that is non-linear, and occasionally I

The NEA controversy is an example of the struggle to determine who has power over the cultural apparatuses of artistic legitimacy. The NEA controversy, in turn becomes a performance in and of itself that involves the post-liminal space of Finley's provocative performance in which what is at stake is the definition of decency, the process of normalisation and the social rules of artistic conduct that legitimise art. The public controversy that ensued in the late eighties and early nineties regarding Karen Finley's work (in particular We Keep Our Victims Ready) and her legitimacy as an artist provide an example of Pierre Bourdieu's assessment on the field of cultural production. "The field of cultural production", Bourdieu observes,

> is the site of struggles in which what is at stake is the power to impose a dominant definition of writer [artist], and to control who defines writer. If we control who is a writer [artist] then we control the production of culture. (Bourdieu, 87)

The normalisation apparatus surrounding the NEA controversy are the ideological apparatuses that maintain the control of culture such as media, and government control talk. Control talk, according to Davis and Stasz is the 'beurocratease' speak of the government or cultural agencies (such as prisons or social workers) in which violent political agendas or actions are concealed by mild encoding of the language used to present the

have used words and cited works that some of my teachers have not known about. Rather than risk their power over me and ask a question, they state that I am inferior or unclear. A sensitive power balance and a coercive system is dependant on my inclusion of the power hierarchy within my own psyche@#!% Foca-ult illustrates the methods of correction when he is speaking of the three corrective modalities of prison. He states, "Individual correction must therefore, assure the process of redefining the individual as subject of law, through the re-enforcement of the systems of signs and representations that they circulate. The apparatus of coercive penalty acts in quite a different way. The point of application of the penalty is not the

government agenda.

Control talk is a way social agents purge their language of any implication of suffering or misery. Some examples;

> Aversive therapy - Painful treatment, such as electric shock. ...Quiet room - solitary lock up. Training schools - Prisons for juvenile delinquents. Along with control talk is bureaucratease, which disguises what is being said; 'the programmatic activity evaluation recording was initiated' means 'Someone started to look at what we were doing'... 'the outcome variables appear only poorly related to the initially determined program objectives' means 'our project didn't do well' (Cohen in Davis and Stasz, 66)

Consequently, the 'control talk' of government agencies, in this instance the NEA and the Supreme Court, then become the field of cultural production that determine who is and who is not a legitimate artist, and what subjects are acceptable for art. Therefore, if I am to return to Bordieu's theory on the defining apparatuses on artists, what is at stake in the NEA controversy is the control of culture itself.

Finley's work is a logical target for the insistence of cultural hegemony, as her work exists outside of traditional liminal expectations for the theatre ritual, and furthermore seeks to disturb the very essence of theatre itself, mimesis. Mimesis as I am using it is the realistic

representation, but the body, time, everyday gestures and activities; the soul, too, but in so far as it is the seat of habits. The body and the soul, as principles of behaviour, from the element that is now proposed for punitive intervention. Rather than on art of representations, this punitive intervention must rest on a studied manipulation of the individual. As for the instruments used, these are no longer complexes of representation, reinforced and circulated but forms of coercion, schemata of constraint, applied and repeated. Excercises not signs: times tables, compulsory movements, regular activities, solitary meditation, work in common, silence, application, respect and good habits. And Ultimately, what

representation of truthful characters, personas, or situations manufactured methodically in a fraudulent environment with the intent to represent reality. Not only is she rejecting the traditional roles of artistic representation, but she is also rejecting the order that may be imposed by mimetic representation or the mimesis of phallologocentric ideologies on the stage. Krista Ann Kern in her PhD dissertation states,

> Finley, in the tradition of written outlaw.... Disrupts the master narrative of the unified subject. Finley accomplishes the unsettling of the master narrative of the unified self through the deployment of her (autobiographical) body. For Finley, the body in performance becomes a medium through which multiple selves are represented (Kern, 206).

Finley is resisting the traditional story telling structures and master narratives of her culture. As well, Finley utilises the body as the site of discourse to express dissent. Therefore Finley's work is threatening not only because she is utilising social taboo (presenting the body outside of its traditional sexualised framework), but because she is also rejecting the order of the father, she is anti-oedipal, anti-mimetic, and performing the 'other' without the mobilisation of chaos or punishment. I will further discuss Finley and her anti-oedipal methodology in relation to her feminist aesthetic in Chapter Two.

one is trying to restore in this technique of correction is not so much the juridical subject, who is caught up in the fundamental interests of the social pact, but the obedient subject, the individual subjected to habits, rules, orders, an authority that is exercised continually around him and upon him, and which he must allow to function automatically in him." (Foucault, 128, 129).
This quote illustrates an agenda similar tothe goals of the university education system. I couldn't help butthink of my university career as I read through Foucaults analysis of institutionalised coercion.
"Kristine you are very creative,but U have to learn that there are rules"
"Yes, ofcourse" I say...I guess I 'really made a mistake then,

Finley's works are permeated by Finley's personal politics. In TCSD, Finley actively shuns mimesis, therefore what is most sacred not only to the theatre goer but to current culture itself, the 'fetishism of the simulacra' (Jameson, 197) is rejected. For Finley there is no simulacrum, and in fact when observing her theatre, there are no stable symbols. In my opinion this is what is most perilous about her work in terms of its aesthetic deviance. Without symbols there is no apparatus to maintain order or heirarchical binary systems of meaning.

Finley is resisting representation, and in so doing resisting her culture allocation of values to the female subject. How can theatre, which is based in the tradition of mimetic representation, in a culture that fetishes over and over again the post-modern image pastiche then present woman?

The discussion of woman and her representation in culture has long been argued and delineated by feminist scholars. Of course there is no consensus on the correct way to re-present woman or images of woman that are not based in specular logic (specular logic being the assertion that woman is defined by what she lacks, as she does not possess what a man possesses, i.e.; a penis.) I would now like to discuss feminist materialist theatre and its acquiescence of Finley's reification of the female subject/object through performative deviance in The Constant State of Desire.

goin into drama, I mean maybe this creativity thing would go over better in business, I really must re-think my career choice."
So what does coercion have to do with Karen Finley? What does my personal experience in this institution, my personal experience have to do with writing?
The personal is the political, and I believe this is so. It is my feminist coercion/rebellio n that brought me to such an understanding. Therefore, I cannot write anything without engaging in these politics, and any writing that I do has essentially been coerced (at least in this institution) by the institution that I am currently attempting to be set free from. Whether the parallel of the institution is the mental hospital of Freuds early patients who were deemed crazy when they displayed the

CHAPTER TWO: FEMINIST THEATRE AND PERFORMANCE

An Introduction to Finley's Aesthetic Disruption

Finley has aligned herself within the tradition of art history, while being strongly connected to the history of feminist theatre and performance. The latter work from the perspective of 'other', and therefore deviate from the mainstream male-dominated traditions of art and performance.

My initial attraction to Finley was her use of theatrical space and her blatant disregard for hiding her personal politics; she is a feminist who appeared to disregard constructing herself in a socially acceptable way. That is, she was shrieking, nude, and overtly political: all of the things you are not supposed to be if you want someone to listen to your feminist point of view. The first time I encountered Finley's work was in a video performance of TSCD's 'yellow' from the film Mondo New York. Finley gives the appearance of disinterest in her audience's political preferences insofar as, she does not care if her feminist politics are unpalatable for her audience. At the time I felt what Finley was doing in her aesthetic was dangerous. Danger is inherent in all political acts, as revealing one's personal politics in open fashion can be volatile if the personal ideology being exposed counters mainstream ideology. In the video performance in Mondo New York, Finely is heckled, ogled, cat- called and called down.

desire of their own will, or whether it be the institution of penalty, the institutions aim is to correct the individual according to the dominant agenda of the state. Once the individual's soul body and mind are corrected they may be set free. Therefore wether the institution is an acting school or an academic school or a nursery school the goals remain the same 'to create obedient subjects who internalise the methodologies and ideologies of control'. I have noticed something in graduate school, that we have masculine and feminine versions of naming similar to French ,she is elle he is il, and then adjectives and verbs are conjugated differently for the feminine or masculine. For example when a male student does not make sense to anyone he is called

During Finley's performance of We Keep Our Victims Ready which Village Voice writer C. Carr observed and wrote about in 1986, male audience members threw lit cigarettes at her while she was performing on the stage.

In TSCD, there is no secret agenda that the audience may glean through the purging of their fear and pity; there is no symbolic catharsis. Finley's politics are up front, on the table, and in your face - there are no subtle metaphors, just her, screaming for justice like a wailing witch.

Finley presents a calculated hysteria, which is striking, both in its delivery and in its reception. Abandoning logic and objectivity for a sign system of hysteria, woman's logic is de-rooted from its hysterical origins. By performing what is traditionally thought of as deviant or undesirable (a hysterical woman) Finley performs a binary terror. That is, Finley performs the negative side of the female binary, she is not a nice girl, nor a virgin or loving mother. The female archetypes that Finley presents are mothers who casually watch TV and smoke cigarettes while being raped by their sons, women covered in eggshells who wish to eat the chocolate covered testes of wall street yuppies, women who 'dream of strangling baby birds' (Finley, TSCD). These figures do not adhere to the nice nurturing side of the female binary, they do not ask coyly for the acceptance of their audience, the female forms of Finley are messy, hysterical, sexual and

genius and when a female student does not make sense she is called illogical. #%@@&* Performance Piece Hum hmmmmm.. Today I will be reading from my paper on the female subject and her position in the realm of theatre, and more particularly the feminist Performance aesthetic of Karen Finley as it transferred to the academy. Of course this has been discussed by many great feminist philosophers already; Jill Dolan, Sue Ellen case, Jeannie Forte and Maria Pragiamoirre to name just a few. However, at this point time I feel it is necessarily necessary to delve into this great expanse again. Why you may ask. Why feminism? Have we not heard enough about representation.... or as Luke strongman suggests must we contest feminisms

angry: all of the things a woman is socialised not to be.

> Finley's performance...in her contamination of the body with images of food and excrement cultivates an experience of excess and threat that defies absorption into a voyeuristic scopic arrangement. She is....an 'unsocialised woman' which is as much to say, a woman resistant to a representational tradition in which the female...is inscribed as the 'docile and useful body' of social discipline. (Lavay, 397)

Finley's performance of the unsocialised woman is an act of subversion, as there is no shame or punishment for her hysterical and messy body. The 'docile and useful' women that are expected in representation are abandoned. Therefore, the hysterical vocal tone in TCSD undermines the history of hysteria which in traditional narratives locates hysteria as something to be controlled, hidden away or locked in an attic. Finley's reclamation of hysteria disrupts the ideological history of woman and her patriarchal representation.

In this paper I am working from the feminist perspective that assumes culture is patriarchal and therefore all ideological state apparatuses are propelled by phallologocentricism. As I illustrated in the first chapter of this paper,

> 'Phallologocentrism' (Derrida's coinage, Following Lacan) inflects

contestation of the representation contest.
In this day and age that is the period which falls after- after the fall of the Berlin wall, after the cold war, after global economics, after Trudeau-mania, or any mania over a political leader which is not related to whom he is sleeping with, in this period which is after 9-11. In this the new millennium that is after and post-everything: post post-modern; post-post colonial, post imperial, post-apocalyptic; post-simulacra, post-bush, present bush and pre-bush...and most importantly post feminist; it is fashionable to overhear our educated colleagues and peers in these very hallowed halls of the great University re-questioning the usefulness of feminism and its pragmatic or non-pragmatic application in

this embedded hierarchy; in the logos, language itself, the phallic signifier organises the production of meaning. (Diamond, 59)

Working from the preceding perspective then allows me to view Finley's work, in particular TCSD, as an intervention or disruption in the phallocentric simulacra of what she perceives as her immediate culture. In an interview with Richard Schechner Finley comments on her work stating;

> I think that I stir people to be responsible for what's going on in their personal lives, in their one to one relationships, interweaving this into the whole society's corruption. That's very disturbing. I destroy the games people live on, a very yuppie world where security is having a 40,000$ a year job, or 120,000$. People really don't want that questioned. What happened to the motivations of 20 years ago of having a much more socialist - humanist society? We're supposed to have more time on our hands because of technology. But I don't see going towards culture of helping people. (Finley in Schechner, 255)

Finley is challenging the individualist notions of current culture, positing the focal point of people's lives (money for individual immediate gratification) as inherently corrupt. Finley disrupts the natural order of the stage and the hierarchy of representation in order to express her dissent

Academia For example. If I may digress here, I was teaching a course on dramatic structure and we were studying a unit on the dramatic form of feminist theatre and one of my students said well I am not a feminist I am a humanist, I don't really think that it is fair to exclude or hate men.
To which all of the other female in the class responded yes, yes this was true for them also, and they too were not feminists but rather humanists. Now perhaps this is not a significant or new insight to those of you who have also taught courses or units on feminism: However what was interesting about these comments was that each on e of these women who spoke up and some of the ones who didn't later wrote in their journals that they were feminist and just afraid to say so,

against a culture that is not geared towards 'helping people'.

Finley rejects representation by the exclusion of mimesis in her work. This rejection of mimesis in Finley's work is dynamic in its resistance to mainstream culture (mimesis, the realistic representative apparatus used by realism to represent truthful characters on the stage). Not only is the absence of mimesis a feminist strategy to undermine the history of realism and women's traditional representation in art, but it is also a rejection of modern consumer culture's utilisation of mimesis (in advertising, media and cultural production) to promote the commodification of desire and the objectification of women as objects.

Finley's resistance to traditional representations of woman in her work, address the audience's desire for the traditional representation of the female body.

> Finley taunts the audience with its desire for a 'classical' body, one that is clean, contained, distant, and therefore safe and paradoxically desirable. (Pramagiorre, 282).

Finley's body in TCSD is not clean, contained nor distant. Finley's presence on the stage is volatile as it does not exist within the boundaries of traditional fourth wall theatre. Finley's theatre utilises direct address and the absence of traditional characterisation in order to exemplify Finley's occupation of female subject: This particular strategy destabilises women's

and that they were angry at the other women in the class for saying feminism was passe, out-dated, and inconsequential. So we see that feminism in our culture or at least in the sub-culture of that particular classroom in that particular school, in that particular hemisphere, in that particular country on that particular day was revealed a dirty word, and it has given me pause.

Therefore, Today I will talk about the Performance of Karen Finley * In North america in order to be a good feminist theatre academic you have to have written your dissertation on Karen Finely....or if not Finely some woman who has smeared her breasts with some form of sauce, fecal matter, blood of chickens eggs...tits and sauce really. we are a nation of phds specializing in tits and sauce. But I digress....so

marginalisation as cultural object. Consequently, the absence of mimesis in TCSD lends itself to a subversion of existing traditional theatre conventions: in particular, realism. In order to establish the importance of Finley's rejection of mimesis and its role in the creation of what I call her aesthetic of deviance I must locate Finley's work within the context of traditional theatre.

I will be discussing Finley and her academic transference, and of course I will be discussing the nature of Performance. As everything is a performance. We are all giving Performances of ourselves and our culture everyday, you are performing that you are my reader.sophistiated, learn-ed..I am performing that I know what I am talking about, I am performing being humble and polite and perhaps a bit provincial...eh? and so too this defense is a performance a Performance in which we all share the same language the language of the academy. So I too am performing....because performance is research or needs to be labeled as such...in order to be validated by the learned structures of the academy - the title of performance, well not of a

A Brief Overview of Feminist Theatre

Feminist theatre and its theory emerged as a result of the women's liberation movement. Women in theatre and other arts had traditionally been represented from a marginal experience or object position, that is, a male centred position. An example of woman's representational economy in traditional art forms such as oil painting, is provided by Jon Berger's theories on the subject (Lavey, 50). Berger observes that women are portrayed in the history of oil painting as the passive object to be gazed upon. Berger suggests,

> Men act and women appear. Men look at women. Women watch themselves being looked at. This determines not only most relations between men and women but also the relation of women to themselves. The surveyor of woman in herself is male: the surveyed female. Thus she turns herself into an object and most particularly

an object of vision: a sight. (Berger in Rodowsky, 51)

Women, their primal desires and experiences were eliminated from subjecthood with the use of Specular logic (Irigary in Diamond, 63). Woman is configured in man's representation apparatuses 'as man' with a small omission; accordingly, she is the mirror of the male experience devoid of agency, (a penis). Therefore woman is relegated to the margins of the male experience, where she is merely the object extension of the male gaze, a referent of man's constructed desire. The women's liberation movement encouraged female artists and philosophers to work from a female centred position. Thereby rejecting the notion that woman is defined by her 'lack' of phallic agency, but rather that woman could subsume her own configuration according to her experience. It is from these beginnings that feminist theatre and female Performance emerged.

Because Finley aligns herself with the tradition of art history (appendix ll), namely modern Performance, and also because she is simultaneously located within feminist theatre genre, I wish to examine the relationship of feminist theatre and feminist Performance praxis in so far as it relates to Karen Finley's Mise en Scene, focussing on feminist theatre and its definition as I will be using it. Although feminist theatre is aligned with the rejection of traditional Aristotelian theatre and representation, and feminist Performance is aligned within the tradition of modern art and

performance but of a lecture which needs to be a performance is the constant state of research, which is why my paper has not incidentally been named A constant state of research well actually it hasn't but I would like to name it that ..maybe, well maybe not. But my point is my own background is in ***(getting bamboozled)*** theatre studies and my emphasis in this paper will be on how ideas and theories about feminist performance reveal the bamboozlefication of commodification of mimetic desire in post-culture. I will not be devoting a great deal of attention to traditional theatre as such, but rather to that variety of activities currently being presented for audiences under the general title of Performance? (with a capital P), 'performance art'.perfromance perfromance

feminist response to woman's exclusion from the male dominated art world, it is my belief that Performance is essential to the execution of materialist feminist theatre. By outlining feminist theatre and some elements of Performance I aspire to illustrate the impact of Finley's aesthetic provocation by aligning it outside of the traditional theatre genre; thereby illustrating the performative deviation away from the theatre ritual.

Early feminist Performances were perhaps more rooted in the development of Avant Garde art, but were closely linked with the female experience garnered in the male dominated 'art stud club' (Schneider, 38). Some of the pioneers in early feminist Performance Art were Carolee Schneeman, Charlotte Moorman, and Shikego Kubota. These female artists and their peers became increasingly interested in the representation of the female object/subject both in art and in the realm of artist.

From the initial performances and related experiences of Schneeman, Kubota and Moorman it becomes apparent that the female body in performance poses a threat not only to the hierarchy of the art world, but to the hierarchy of culture itself. In reference to the male dominated art world's rejection of early feminist Performance authored by Schneeman, Kubota and Moorman, Rebecca Schneider states,

> For the woman artist authoring the work, the problem was immense. The explicit body was not the problem - there had been

perfffff Fu uh For this exploration I will be drawing upon insights provided by Elin Diamond in her article Mimesis, Mimicry and The True Real. I am sure you have all heard of this article and have it memorized by now (pretentious chuckle) but as a young scholar this article is new to myself and perhaps may serve as an advantageous foundation for the young scholars that are here today. Now let us examine Lacan briefly (and I apologize for the re-visitation) - However, it is important to note the obvious affiliation between Irigaray and The Speculum of the Other Woman, Diamond?s Mimesis and The True real, and Lacan's language of the Self, And Of course Derrida's difference which is derived also from Lacan who is furthering the psychoanalytic

> exposure in art for centuries - but the lines by which the explicit body was explicated, by which it was framed displayed, and even, more importantly, 'authored' had been very well policed by juridical and avant-garde establishments alike. (Schneider, 40).

The art world of the early sixties and seventies was not receptive to these women authoring their own representation. For women to create their own representation in their work was to overstep a cultural boundary; as the art world and the tradition of art history was/is based upon the female object and its construction in relation to the male gaze. These early performance artists had begun to include their experience not only as women, but also as female artists in a male dominated art community. The inclusion and reclamation of the female body destabilised both traditional and Avant garde art genres as it sought to explore the exclusion and othering of women and female experience in the art world. Consequently the avant-garde circles that feminist performance artists were a part of became threatened by the assertion that they were not any different from the traditional art world which they sought to break away from; in fact they are/were parallel in their desire to fetishise the female object and other her within culture.

Arguably one of the first women to include the body in her work as a symbol of her female status as token 'cunt mascot' in the art world was

works of Freud who is furthering....well who is the beginning of time.

Lacan deconstructs the abolitionist agency of self interpolating the notion the Cartesian ego, or apriori of selfhood, into the realm of deligitimization. Thus, the Lacanian (point) I/eye (no point sorry the eye/I) reveals the ?self? as a system of discursively determined axioms. The feminist reading of this de-coded self, is the ?I?(point to I) self exists symbolically, and is incumbent upon its mirrored recognition (point to eye), (point to all eyes)praise the eyes of potatoes, therefore, the female may not enter culture or self without the phallus. The self of course is based upon definition of that which it is not, and therefore depends on a binary

Carollee Schneeman.

> Importantly much of her impulse to include her own body in her work came from the fact that when Schneeman began constructing the installation (eye/body 62) the artist was fed up with feeling that her gender inhibited her consideration as a serious contributor in the art world...she had felt she had partial status and was personally troubled by the suspicion that she was included only as a 'cunt mascot' in the heavily male cliques of Fluxes and Happenings. (Schneider, 34)

Schneeman's installation, eye/body included the presentation of her own nude body. Therefore not only was there a nude object by which to gaze upon, the female object could also gaze back. Perhaps what was most interesting about this piece as it is described by Schnieder in her book The Explicit Body in Performance, is the notion that the female body gazes back upon the eyes of the voyeur. This female body is not detached from her own objectification.

> Schneeman's interest began ... by her experience as female artist in the male dominated movements of Fluxes and Happenings, pushing her to explore the ways in which material flesh existed in bodies which could not be divorced from the histories of their socio-cultural signification. This preoccupation with... the object status of

opposition.

Let us examine the architectonic (if you will) that occurs between Derrida and his furthering of Lacan's meconnaissance (with an accent egu, ooooh I just love the accent egu, the way it rolls off the tongue you can just taste it) mmm,
To illustrate...aaahh yes my amazing ..my personal discovery which I am about to share...
To illustrate this more clearly I have brought along two of my favorite chums which will help me interpolate the theories of Lacan and Derrida into three dimensional space . These are my mini-me's of theory, ma petit ajet jacques.
(if you can't see me I am holding two little hand puppets of derrida & lacan)
'Monsieur-Lacan'

'Monsieur Derrida'

> the female body relative to its socio-cultural delimitation's - generated a turning point , a politicising point, a feminist turn in her work. It was Eye/body...Schneeman was among the very first American installations to incorporate the artist's own body as primary visual and visceral terrain. (Schneider, 33)

Although the avant-garde art world at the time was interested in re-exploring notions of the nude body in art space, this interest was only pertinent if the body was of male gender. Work that included the female body in control of its own representation was often refereed to as self indulgent or completely discredited.

> Lucy Lippard addressed the continuing dismissal of women's artwork; 'men can use beautiful, sexy women as neutral objects or surfaces, but when women use their own faces and bodies, they are immediately accused of narcissism'. (Lippard in Schneider, 35)

The early ermergings of theatrically based feminist Performances were concerned with both the reclamation of female experience, and female representation. Whether or not feminist theatre was inspired by these early works of feminist Performance or whether it emerged simultaneously as its own entity is speculative at best. However, the early emerging of Feminist theatre and feminist Performance share some similar concerns; women being recognised and represented in art and artistic expression as

'Com mon ca va msr Derrida'
'ooh je Tres tres bein msr lacon, com ma ca va msr Lacon'

'mmm com ce com sa'

Thus from this example identity and is based on a miss recognition or meconn-aissance. That is meconaissance with and accent egu (mmmmm tastes like Belgian choclate) So then we must ask how does this catachresis of self, function in relation to the gendered feminine on the diachronic and synchronic stages or rather as Peggy Phelan might say the unmarked politics of a feminist performance. I will put these guys away ... aurevoir. Mon mini me. Before I attempt to answer this query it is important to examine in a more particular fashion the Aristotelian foundations as

something more than a peripheral object to be gazed upon, created soley for the male subject. Women wanted agency in their artistic expression, and legitimacy as artists in their own right.

Feminist theatre, like early female Performance, became concerned with the methodologies of female representation. Women began to question the ability to accurately express a female centred experience in a format whose tradition was so closely linked with the masculine experience, such as Aristotelian theatre.

A clear example of feminist theatre foundations may be provided by the early work of Sue Ellen Case. In Case's book, Feminist Theatre, Case outlines an alternative to traditional Aristotelian theatre, suggesting that Aristotle's dramatic structure and his theory of mimesis relegate women to the objectified margins of patriarchal culture. Case observes that cultural divisions of power are gender specific, and that the history of theatrical representation serves a patriarchal hegemony. Therefore, because women have not traditionally occupied the public spheres of society, 'real' women could not possibly occupy representation.

> The new feminist analyses prove that division is gender specific; i.e. public life is the property of men, and women are relegated to the private sphere. As a result of the suppression of real women, the culture invented its own representation of the gender, and it was

everything comes back to Aristotle...to audit the Aristotelian foundations of Diamond and her interpretation of Irigaray, and her consequent interpretations of Lacan, and Lacan's interpretations of Freud, and Freud's interpretations of well the world in general.
The Aristotelian ideal of drama or tragedy is complicitous in the hermeneutic devaluation of the feminine.
Now that said I would like to look at something Sue Ellen Case has said.
I have a quote from Sue Ellen case here...mmm let me see. I Can't find quote oh hers a Tampon, lipstick. Oh yes here, Case notes that, Greek culture denied subjectivity to women but elevated or excoriated Woman, whose um whatevs this is bla bla we all knowthis one

this fictional 'Woman' who appeared on the stage (Case, 6)

The feminist theatre's rejection of mimesis, is not enough to reclaim woman or representations of 'real' woman on the stage. Although cultural feminist theatre argues that women can create their own mimesis via female centred drama or woman conscious drama, Jill Dolan points out that both feminist theatre and cultural feminist theatre must address the nature of desire in representation in order to transcend the patriarchal encoding of woman and her simulation in theatrical space.

> Representation is a 'repressive system...enforced by the laws of language, signs and cultural codes.' The cultural feminist theatres free images of women from the constraints of realism, but cannot detach them from the oppressions of the representational apparatuses and its ideological encoding. Representation conspires to relate conventional meanings and lay transcendent, universalising traps despite experimental forms. (Dolan, 96).

Therefore, it is not enough for the feminist theatre practitioner to merely 'redeem' woman from mimetic representation, rather, Dolan suggests that the feminist theatre practitioner and artist must seek to redeem representation from its ideological encoding. Dolan observes,

> Unless desire is addressed (in cultural Feminist theatre) a woman in representation can never be more than the Woman she is seen to be

anyhoo...gender attributes. John Hopkins press. Continuing on uh Representation, we tend to say, inevitably transforms female subjects into gendered , fetishised objects whose referent is ideologically bound to dominant (heterosexual) models of masculinity and femininity. Is the mimesis of absent present a deixis of theatre which easily determines and binaurally validates the feminine? Of course I cannot answer this question adequately as I may only ASS Uuume the potential impact upon the numerous interpretive strategies of any given audience, and their (millyooooou) of receptionz vorgaben or as is the correct German pronunciation... recpetione vorgabsionnea.... German is such a sexy language isn't it.

by the dominant culture - the object of male desire (Dolan, 97). According to Dolan the desire and representation of woman are intertwined, they are ideologically bound. Therefore to ignore the construction of desire in representation is to ignore the cultural encoding of woman herself. That is, gender and its performance are bound to the reproduction of desire through representation. The notion that desire must be addressed in feminist representation on the stage is intrinsic to Finley's materialist feminist aesthetic. Because representations of woman have historically been created from systems of male desire, Finley's female 'emanations' present a series of deviations from familiar female referents. That is to say, Finley's anti-Aristotelian aesthetic de-familiarises traditional representations of woman. This is in part because Finley is utilising elements of feminist Performance.

Finley reclaims representation and addresses male desire as functions in the construction of gender oppression and symbolic world ordering. Finley's ability to address desire in representation is her partial use of the strategies of feminist Performance, as Jeanie Forte notes in her article Women's Performance Art: Feminism and Post-Modernism, feminist performance art is a "deconstructive strategy...a discourse of the objectified other" (Forte, Ed: Case, 252). Because Finley does not use the traditional memorised text of theatre, rather she does a series of performances that are

Now... the inevitable question that I must ask is, How can one truly know that any theatre is feminist rather than masculinist, and why is it inherent in the definition of a feminist theatre to presume that the other is inherently masculine as it were
Now at this time perhaps it would be of value to look at an example of masculinist theatre of the Aristotelian dramatic ideal. Introducing monsieur oh I mean Madame Barbie and monsieur Ken....they are doing a scene from hamlet, Barbie looks pretty and ken is telling her she is a slut..well done Barbie, well done Ken. Ok. Lovely ..
Mmm .....Perhaps Msr Derrida and Msr Lacan can help us out here (I have pulled out my puppets,) 'Bjr msr Lacan'

unrehearsed, she engages in the representational resistance of what Peggy Phelan terms Performance.

> Performance in a strict ontological sense is non-reproductive...[it] clogs the smooth machinery of reproductive representation necessary to the circulation of capital (Phelan, 148)

Phelan is referring to the methodology employed by artists who are attempting to resist the strategies of commodification and consumption of their work. Phelan locates 'performance' as a resistant to the re-inscriptive strategies of representation and desire. My next chapter will deal specifically with desire in TSCD, therefore, at this time I would like to return to the construction of Finley's feminist aesthetic.

In order to understand Finley's provocative deviancy, it is important to understand her subversion of traditional theatre. Therefore, I will illustrate a brief outline of materialist feminist theatre in relation to traditional Aristotelian theatre. Finley's deviation away from traditional Aristotelian theatre and modern stage aesthetic such as realism, opens the door to multiplicitous representation that is not based in the patriarchal encoding of desire, but is derivative of the Uncoding of the female object in representation.

'Bjr msr Derrida'

'Com ma ca va msr Lacan.? Msr Lacan what do you think is.. Le difference entre le masculine et le feminine'

'well.....uh well.... uh Msr derrdia that is a difficult question,je pense que....the penis' why don't' you take your shoes off get comfy, I am taking my shoes off.
OK So then that is clear The tradition of theatre as we know it here in North America which extends both through the synchronic and diachronic paradigms (I said shoes off) of effective theatre and tragedy. (Fix you glasses I don't mind I you have a gin, I'm having one) This theatre history or evolution stems from the Aristotelian definition of tragedy. (Aristotle goes better with a nightcap)
For example a good tragedy should have six

The Transgressive Aesthetics of Materialist Feminist Theatre

a) representation

Professor Rosalind Kerr at The University of Alberta, specialises in feminist theory and theatre. Kerr has created a clear guideline for Materialist Feminist theatre and its contrast to traditional Aristotelian theatre. Kerr's research has spanned several years, focussing on materialist feminist theory and representations of women in traditional theatre. Her outline establishes traditional Aristotelian theatre characteristics. Traditional theatre based upon Aristotle's poetics is seen to commonly possess the following attributes;

> Transcendence... progressive narrative plot, conflict (the basis for dramatic action), climax, resolution, character development, inevitability of fate (the inevitability of ideological order, social stratum validated by moral or punishment), evocation of fear and pity (catharsis), Single voiced, male point of view (phallologocentric simulacrum), patriarchal ideology, traditional and elite phallic paradigm (of symbolic order), Truth (is the goal) enacts technologies of power, subjectivity mimics structures of male dominant culture binary oppositions: self/other, masculine/feminine." (Kerr, Class handout, appendix I.)

Paralleled with the Aristotelian framework and its inherent patriarchal

elements...Someti mes I like to rip pages out of texts its very liberating, (you can rip a page out of this one if you like) I don't have the quote copied so I will circle it here in lipstick for you. I did make those handouts but oh well the universe has other pl[illegible] for us. ([illegible]e on rip it out) here P[illegible]mythos(univ[illegible]rsal truth) Character Music Spectacle Catharsis dict[illegible]/language [illegible]om the tex[illegible] Understanding plays I understand[illegible] As has been suggested both by Sue Ellen Case and Elin Diamond Aristotelian theatre, provides the foundations for twentieth century realism.I am just going to rid myself of some conformity here and take off this shirt...hot hot inhere. buring.Theatre finds it difficult to rid itself of the mimetic structure not only because the drama was

ideology as suggested by Kerr, is feminist materialist theatre. Unlike the theatre of Aristotle's poetics, the feminist theatre that Kerr illustrates is geared seemingly towards the breakdown and demystification of the traditional Aristotelian theatre paradigm. Where Aristotelian theatre is based in the goal to reveal the signification of 'truth', the theatre of feminist materialism's goal is to destabilise existing systems of truth.

Kerr lists Feminist Materialist theatre's attributes as Aristotelean theatre's antithesis. Materialist feminist theatre's goal as illustrated by Appendix I, is to transform ideology and culture. According to Kerr's analysis, feminist materialist theatre is,

> fragmented, episodic, resists climax (resists universalising truths)....(with) shifting points of view, reveals partiality of ideology, challenges hierarchies, breaks symbolic structures, contextualises the truth, challenges the artificiality of gender, race and class divisions. (Kerr, Appendix I).

Integral to the materialist feminist aesthetic that Kerr describes is the feminist theatre practitioner's rejection of realism. Realism tends to re-inscribe existing hierarchies, therefore realism's inability to demystify patriarchal ideology makes it an undesireable for the feminist theatre practitioner

Realism's fetishistic attachment to the true referent and the

Aristotle's (I am just going to outline important words) like specific object articulating the mimetic art,(oh my god its hot in here.) the discourse of theatre cannot rid itself temptation refer to employ, to remember, to show.? Blah blah blah.....Realism is the modern theatre's response to mimesis....? Ok those aren't really my own words but I probably don't need to tell you whose they are.... Find piece. Now I have a quote that responds to that particular quote oh yes.... No its actually another quote referring to the quote prior that responds the quote of the quote that I did not quote. I 'm sorry who did I quote. Yes. I have been accused of being disorganized but really I am not limited by masculine structures.. Ok I can't seem

> spectator's invitation to rapturous identification with a fictional imago serve the ideological function of mystifying the means of material production, thereby concealing historical contradictions, while re-affirming or mirroring the 'truth' of the status quo. (Diamond, 61)

Diamond indicates that realism is the modern theatre's integration of Aristotle's poetics.

Realism is problematic for a feminist theatre praxis as it strives to represent reality. Reality (defined as a series of stable referents that determine what is experienced as 'true' or 'real') is created by the same social hierarchies that create language, logic and symbolic order. Therefore, reality is subject to hierarchical value systems that favour dominant ideologies.

Not only is the notion of 'truth' or reality suspect for the feminist theatre practitioner, so is truth's realistic representation. As Diamond observes, this is due to realism's offer of,

> 'an unexaggerating mirror of real life'....The life like stage sign is not only validated by, it reinforces the epistemology of an 'objective world' for the referent does not simply exist...it is reaffirmed in the activity of reception. Realism is more than an interpretation of reality passing as reality; it produces 'reality' by positioning its

to find that quote right now....
So then it is clear this theatre of mimesis is problematic for the feminist theatre practitioner. Firstly because as Sue Ellen case States,
and actually I should add that her arguments are not rock solid and I am aware of that..her writing and logic are somewhat flawed as are most feminist writings...in the sense that they do posses and academic rigor...as it were, but some of her ideas when developed further prove to be quite useful... Such as her ideas on Aristotelian theatre. She states,
Aristotle's theatre , denies women the capacity to exemplify tragic virtue's, the erasure of women from and form social representation means that mimesis is not possible for them? ...Sorry Barbie....there

spectator to recognise and verify its truths. (Diamond 60).

Representations of reality are doubly dubious in their consequent simulation of the 'real', which in reproduction is always based on a referent that has already been informed by the suspect truth of other referents. The referent is a map of socio-cultural desire and therefore it is bound to ideological encoding. Consequently the referent is distrustful in its creation. Therefore, representation conspires to reproduce male centred constructions of woman and her world, on and off the stage. Similar to Beaudrillard's notion of simulation, the reproduction of woman is culturally perpetuated by 'real' women's emulation of constructed symbologies of woman. The reproduction of woman and her sphere are created from the referent, which is already in simulation. As Beaudrillard points out in his book Simulations, "the real is not only what can be reproduced, but that which is already reproduced. The hyperreal...which is already in simulation" (cover text).

Finley's TCSD is an excellent model for exploring the feminist problematisation of representation and the feminist materialist aesthetic described by Kerr. Finley's text is episodic, non-linear and her performance does not rely on traditional forms of mimesis. In fact Finley's aesthetic is really a combination of feminist materialist aesthetic and feminist Performance. It is Finley's immediate performance and resistance of

will be no mimetic representation for you.....In the trash can for you sweetie! Throwing a sweet little tart like Barbie in the trash is fun. My mom's name is Barbie.
Return to your paper reading style...(glasses fix.) Go to authority
Of course there are other problems in Aristotle's poetics like the idea of truth or universality is problematised by the feminist scholar who seeks to de-stabilize truth, as truth and universality are phallologocentric in nature.
**** About to find quote in bra crevice***... I have a quote that that I would like to read in response to that ...oooh I can't find it.....but I have this one in my Bra crevice The quote by Liz Goodman ..Oh that's never happened to me before...but I will run with it...it's uhhh very hyper

mimesis that align her within the framework of Performance.

Finley's episodic multi-voiced framework lends itself to a disruption of the unified subject, which in turn alludes to the artifice of the capitalist society's individualist self. As Krista Ann Kern's study maintains, Finley

> creates a connected sense of selves through 'energy' and 'voices' that she channels ....Her trance performances disrupt the universal notion of the unified self, while they disrupt the experiences of the self as empty, non-communal. (Kern, 208)

In order to illustrate Finley's interference of the unified subject and the ensuing disruption to representations of 'woman', I believe that it is necessary to further examine the episodic structure of TCSD.

b)Multiplicity

TCSD is divided into sections, which although they are separated from one another there is no clear definition in their progression. As illustrated by Kerr's outline, in a traditional play there is a story or plot told which progresses in a linear realistic framework, with the use of character. The plot's resolution affirms a universalising 'truth' that reinforces existing social hierarchies and ideologies. Finley's' text TSCD and many of her other works such as, The Distribution of Empathy, Shut Up and Love Me,

text of me...
Bra crevice
Quote #2
this is from Liz Goodman And I quote...I won't read whole thing...

Oh sorry I was reading it to myself.
Thus it becomes clear that this linear drive towards a singular goal is phallocentric as it not only mimics the male orgasm but also re-inscribes the male goal oriented subject.
I really feel the need to alter our perspective here.....I feel in order to alter our perspective...I am going to alter mine...
I am now standing on my desk here..much better,
Now I was speaking of the modern drama or the involvement of psychology in realism.
Psychology constructs the female or the feminine in absence, hysteria and fear. The

and A Certain Level of Denial, possess no clear definitive story line. Nor do these texts possess character development which, the audience may observe in mimetic chronology. Finley's texts consist of multiple scenes that are not defined by a through-line of action. Rather, the scenes bleed into one another as characters morph in and out of each other not by mimetic representation, but by a vocal channelling through Finley herself.

> Finley's performing body becomes the site of an invasion of voices -- male and female.... a place of 'imprecise boundaries' (Lavey, 365).

It is as though the characters in Finley's theatre are summoned to the stage by theatrical seance. Examples of the seance like channelling I have described occur throughout TCSD; however, I would like to draw upon one example provided by the transition between the sections entitled First Sexual Experience, and Refrigerator.

> Then I mount my own mama in the ass. That's right. I fuck my own mama in the ass. 'Cause I'd never fuck my own mamma in the snatch. ...(she) takes a drag out of her Pall Mall and says 'boy you got lazy ass cum. Your cum ain't salty.
>
> **Refrigerator**
>
> And the first memory I have of my father, is him putting me in the refrigerator he'd take off all my clothes and put my five year old

female is created as the mirror of male absent the penis. Therefore, she is the inferior, and has penis envy which propels her through life, and sometimes to madness. Women is not created as a woman but rather as an inferior male. The female is configured as a man minus (cut off penis) the possibility of representing her self as a man this idea of woman as lack..is called specular logic.(make a monocle with you speculum) *****I have another quote Coming from leg my sexy sexy me sexy leg.****.. BODY QUOTE #3 QUOTE #3 **Freud's penis envy becomes An epiphenomenon of specular logic. It is not enough for women to lack the penis, they must be envious, driven by the desire to have it, thereby confirming to men that they still possess it. It**

bare bottom on the silver rack... Than my daddy is giggling' and smilin. Don't you know I hate smiles and laughter. Don't you know I hate good feelings. 'Cause the only feelings I show are no feelings at all, girl. Just no feelings at all'. (Finley, Ed; Martin, 301)

Within two paragraphs of text Finley has occupied the vocal sphere of a son raping his mother, the mother figure, a daughter being raped by her father, and the father. This undifferentiating character morphology occurs throughout the text.

In the preceding text segment there is no clear definition between the characters, nor are the characters individually associated with a specific dramatic field constructed particularly for their character representation: there is no definitive costume, colour or vocal colouring for any particular character that is presented. The vocal channellings that Finley emanates appear randomly, as though they are the articulation of a schizoid dream. In adverse formation to the tradition of theatrical realism, the only presence on the stage is Finley and the vocal conjuring of simultaneous incestuous unions.

Finley's resistance to unified character attempts to divorce itself from the realism's reproduction of male centred universalising assemblages, or the assimilation of those assemblages in the production of woman. The definitive lines between the characters and the synchronic progression of

is her female envy that in effect fills out the mirror reflection, making her look like the male looking at himself?
Irigaray...
Routledge Press.
Routledge never lets you down, ya know.
I Unzip my skirt
Grazing my crotch with yet another delicious quote, I.Pull it from my thigh high, matter of factly. Of course..that is where I keep such quotes...
Freud's penis envy becomes An epiphenomenon of
lack
penis,
we must be envious,
driven
by desire
have it,
confirm men are firm, to men , to still that posses.
It is her female.
Envy effect fills mirror reflection, make look like male look? Iri gay...Rut pledge Press.
the feminist theatre seeks to deconstruct psychology, mimesis and

the scenes are blurred, in an attempt to obscure the differentiation's between the roles of the subject. Therefore the referents of mother/son, father/daughter, masculine/feminine, become slippery and unstable. This theatre of episodic multiplicity rejects representations of linear signification based upon a system of hierarchical referents. TCSD performs an ontological terror, as it eliminates the very fabric of our cultural understanding by undermining universalising symbolic referents.

An example of Finley's ontological terrorism is evident in the section entitled "My First Sexual Experience". "My First Sexual Experience" begins with Finley articulating the experience of simultaneously existing as a baby, and as a penis engaged in the act of intercourse with her/his Mother.

> My First sexual experience was at the time of my birth, passing through the vaginal canal. That red pulsing tunnel, that alley of love. I'm nothing but a human penis. And at the time of my . I'm fucking my own mama at my own birth. ...I spend my life looking for hot mamas with hot titties .... I love to find a hot young mama with a young bald baby.... And I take her baby, a bald headed baby and put downy fabric softener on that babys head. Then I strap that baby around my waist till its a baby dildo. Then I take that baby, that dildo and fuck it's own mama. 'Cuz I am nothin but a

linear narrative and meta-narrative.
(pull out feminist theatre handout)
BODY QUOTE #4 Comes from crotch...
Now I have brought some other hand outs that I would like us to go through together...
Oh I'm sorry your jealous you don't have the handout.....her take my skirt.
..Ok yes That basically lists the elements of a FEMALE Performance Aesthetic and that is Performance with a capital P.
Rest...on table very coy
List things .....
Transformational
..Mutlivoiced
Re-presentational
...Ok we know all of these things...
This brings us to Karen Finley, and the female performance with a capital P practitioner.(write P on board)
Make a cave with your shirt. At home.Finley's theatre is the theatre of the womb. As Plato had suggested in his theory of the

> motherfucker, nothing but a motherfucker. ...But she's a dried old cow, a dried old sow. A DRIED OLD SOW!! (Finley, Ed, Martin, 299)

Finley's subversion of Freud utilises a synchronous ontology of masculine and feminine. Finley is vocalising an event that is physically impossible to create in the 'real' space-time frame of the stage; in a fixed sign system of referents, it is impossible to be a woman, a male baby, and a human-penis simultaneously while narrating from the centre of a sexual act. Within three sentences Finley has created a multiplicitous representation that defies the possibility of representation itself. Therefore the tactic of multiplicity enables a symbolic anarchy, immobilising traditional forms of representation while undermining universalising cultural meta-narratives such as Freudian psychology. In TCSD Finley,

> Interrupts the work of linguistic representation, exposing it as a system of non-naming, mis-naming, overnaming, as system in which meaning is elusive at best. (Pramagiorre, 271).

Finely has in turn created a performative multiplicity that is completely aware of itself as a performance and the audience's desire for representation. That is to say, Finley does not become the character of 'baby dildo' so that the audience may suspend their disbelief but rather so that they will be incited to disbelief/disbelieve. Like Brecht's *verfremdung*

man in the cave, the cave acts as a theatre in that it is the illusory component of what is outside the cave, and hence when man exists the cave he enters the? light of the father? the truth...However, feminists such as Luce Irigaray see this already specular logic as a possibility for the feminine...as the cave is the feminine..it is duplicitous it is the mother...

And I quote...BODY QUOTE #5 from left breast **?What might be the effects of this audacious ?womb-theatre ? for feminist theatre theory? To imagine a theatre whose mimetic system is not referable to one model, one paradigm..domi nated by truth is to undermine the ideality of logos as truth, the basis of Western thought and mimesis theory since Plato and Aristotle.?** Yes that's Elin

effect, Finley's narrative presence, devoid of empathetic character portrayal eliminates the audience's ability to fade into cathartic complacency (i.e., they have had their cry for the characters, witnessed the climax and its resolution, and now they may go home unaware and complacent in their continual cultural subordination). Via the tactic of non-universalising multiplicity, Finley attempts to ignite the audience's consciousness.

Diaaamonddddddd ....
My shirt is making a tunnel representing this womb theatre! This womb mother of theatre that shows the untruth of truth, then may be used for female Performance. That is to say, the mother shows the world or what lays outside the cave as 're-presentation'... therefore according to Irigaray there evolves in the feminist Plato aesthetic ?the Mimesis of an absent present?...(so good....because I love these quotes...)
Hence it becomes clear that Finley is the absent present... Finely exists in both subject/object position, she is both the victim and the victimizer, mother and mother -fucker.
Body quote #6
Pull that quote from my ass/other breast
Quote #6
Mother Fucker...
By me.

c)The Gaze

Finley integrates her provocative questioning of representation in an amalgamation of performative resistance (anti-mimesis) with the use of text and language that are violent in their dissent against a linguistic culture of misogyny, and the use of the abject feminine body, her own. According to Pramagiorre ,Finley reverses

> the traditional relationship between voyeuristic spectator and exhibitionist performer by presenting an active bodily economy of production and reproduction (Pramagiorre, 271).

This particular theatrical trait (the reversal of the voyeuristic role), is revolutionary as it demands that Finley's audience take stock of the commodification of women as fetishised objects in art and in culture.

Finley examines the commodification of woman both in her text and

in her presentation of her body in theatrical space. Finley's 'bodily economy' is based on the commodified exchange of the culturally constructed male gaze, undermining the traditional male gaze of desire by locating it within the realm of the perverse or disgusting. When asked about the pornographic potential in her work, Finley located her use of the fetishised female body as an act of subversion stating,

> I think this destroys pornography for many men. Usually you look at porn and jerk off. Here, there's a disgust and many straight men don't want to associate their sexual fantasies with something disgusting (Finley in Lavey, 389).

Finley's use of the grotesque mingled with the traditional signifiers of female objectification, create a disruptive sign system for the male gaze. Male desire is problematised in addition to the audience's voyeurism as both are dislocated from culturally dominant referents of the desirable female symbolic. Finley gives voice to the female body of objectification, and that in itself is a violence to the consumption of the desirable female image which is traditionally silent. In an interview with Finley, Richard Schechner observes this phenomenon in Finley's TCSD, stating that what is threatening about Finley's reversal of the gaze is,

> not only the ideas behind what she is saying, but the words themselves...because 'sexual women' are often constructed by

That quote is from me and my published works..I can autograph it for you later... Ofcourse I have another quote which also makes similar poignant observations but at this point why bother...
Karen Finley's work is an excellent example of a feminist praxis in theatre Performance with a capital P. (you might want to write that down..)And perhaps the french language can rescue us here once again...as Finley the female performer cannot exist in the english language as she may only be defined by the masculine.
As a female presence she is obliterated. In french However, she can live – she is..Une Performatrisse. Get back on the center of the platform...
In the Performatrisse aesthetic Finley embodies, the

males as being invisible, physical, and literally dumb, without words. Men, and many women too, obviously continue to see women as objects. Women are subjects only in selected fields where they must act according to definite rules that have been set down by men...what you are presenting is a woman who is a subject expressing the sexual violence and humour that women are still supposed to be the objects of, or ignorant of, or excluded from (Schechner, 256).

The audience's gaze is trained to consume images. In theatre catharsis is the measure by which the success of image consumption may be gauged. Catharsis occurs as result of realism's evocation of fear and pity, therefore the deconstruction or elimination of catharsis dispels the audience's tendency to passively consume the resolutions' offered by the dark theatre. Looking at TCSD, it becomes clear that there is no resolution, there has been no catharsis, as it ends with a warning.

> And I just remembered the custom of our nation during war- of tying pregnant women's ankles while they are giving birth. Such a civilised culture. Such kind peoples...let me tell ya how I look at young men in blood-soaked costumes. Let me tell you how I look at women undressing behind closed doors...I'm your voyeur. I'm your exhibitionist. I'm your pervert, your fool, your martyr and

female body as text, therefore signifying the traditional female space of object and at the same time, de-stabilises the referent, and the male gaze through which the referent is re-created.
Now together let us look at Finley's work in an attempt to identify the feminist aesthetic at work. Let us examine her present absence, with the academic tools with which we have been equipped.
Bra Comes off
mortar board hat goes on
My academic tools ladies and gentleman...30 thousand dollars of student loans worth of graduate academic tools.
a bargain that is now at peril...
Could you please write peril on my back?
Peril peril with a capital P...
a capital P...
does it have quotation marks
IT MUST BE IN QOUTATION MARKS
You think this is

fool. I'm your Donald Trump, your Baby M. I'm your real-estate, your profits, your greed. But something's gotta give. Somethings' gotta give. Somethings gonna happen. (Finely Ed, Martin, 302 - 303)

In this section not only is Finley avoiding a resolution to her performance but she is also occupying the synchronous space of voyeur and exhibitionist. Finley, is herself is an unstable referent dual and un-definitive in her binary resistance. Finley is aware of the role of the audience, the nature of audience being incumbent upon the audience's engagement in a necessary amount of voyeurism. That is, in order to be an audience, the audience must observe, watch and gaze upon Finley from a distance. As I previously discussed the voyeuristic role of the audience is traditionally passive and the gaze is constructed by patriarchal ideologies. Finley however, is purposefully drawing her audience's attention to their voyeuristic role, de-rooting the passivity from the audience's observational act, subverting their gaze with her own.

Like Carolee Schneeman's eye/body, Finley is gazing upon her audience directly, watching them as they sit observing her; therefore, they too are engaged in the act of performance. Finley interrupts the distant power of the audience's voyeurism as she defiantly exhibits herself as 'pervert', in a 'civilised culture' whose ideology is bound to the customs of

funny?
No wait you're mad..aren't you?
You think this is just the abject object again?You think I am abused?
I am just acting out my abuse...that I need help
well I am abused
I am the abject objectified subject
Yeah thats right I am re-presenting your abject body right back to baby.
I am a pathetic excuse for art.
or perhaps I am lacking in academic rigour.....
No this is derivative just derisive haven't we seen this before?
Besides I am too sexy to be a crone..toosexy to be a crone too sexy to be a crone?
Lets just lock up these twenty nine year old titties and never talk about them again....
This piece is some flaky feminist thing...
or am I not feminist enough isn't that right?
this is artistic

history where the ankles of women are tied when they are giving birth in country that is at war.

excess
aren't I just up here shooting myself in the foot?
How do you like it?
give me back my shirt.
Give me back my skirt..
my socks...
these clothes are never gonna fit
these clothes are never gonna fit
well I am a bad feminist
I am just another pair of titties in sauce
I lack the academic rigor to comment adequately on your culture..
I am a crazy bitch whose analysis is naive
I am naive...
I am willful and I am here to terrorize you
I am your worst nightmare....
I am north americas ugly excess...
I am invisible, too radical and illogical, I am poorly written..
I am ignorant
De-scribe me...I am writing back to this invisible empire....
I am here to terorrise you....please dismiss me....

d) The social pervert

The role of the pervert is integral to social reconstruction. Shannon Bell's research of the pervert in Deluzian analysis concludes,

> The pervert resists oedipalisation... he/she has invented other territorialities to operate in (Deluze and Guitari in Bell, 30).

Finley's aesthetic territory is the territory of the deviant pervert, which in Finley's illustration of a culture of based on misogyny is preferable to what is considered 'normal'.. Finley is abnormalising, what is considered acceptable in her culture celebrating her own deviance in resistance to dominant cultural ideologies.

Finley's abnormalising strategy is apparent in her articulation of 'Such a civilised culture. Such a great land. Such a kind people'. This statement is rife with satirical subversion. True to feminist materialist theatre that seeks to break from realism's mystification of ideology, Finley conjures the history of her culture into the present. She is eliminating the false distance between the history of her culture's ruthless misogyny and its current modern ideology. In Finley's mise en scene this land, this culture is

based on the torture of women. To this, Finley offers no resolution, she merely states that, 'something is going to happen, something is goin to happen'.

As Finley occupies the role of martyr/fool, exhibitionist/ pervert, she is dislocating the possibility of conclusive resolution within binary based value systems. Finley is naming herself against binary divisions, she is naming herself multiplicitously, creating the act of her naming in a space that is between binary sense making apparatuses. TCSD ends in anti-cathartic fashion, in its obvious resistance to western binary patterns of naming and meaning.

In addition to the elimination of Aristotelian catharsis, Finley's absence of character development de-stabilises the ability of the audience to create symbolic meaning through a system of fixed referents: Consequently, if the referent does not exist or cannot exist due to the absence of binary logos, representation cannot exist.

> This de-constructive inbetweeness of Finley's technique can be extended to the issue of gender...Finely 'subverts the traditional gender expectations 'because she appropriates the male perspective while maintaining the female gender'. (Wilcox, 34)

Lacan's mirror ain't never been so ugly... small speaker in mouth , a beautiful french voice comes out ahhh. I love I love George Bataille, he sounds better in french, I can't understand him in english anyway.... maybe someday quoting George will get me lucky..... $$$$$$$$$$ My experience is subjective. Funny how female experience is relegated to the subjective even though it never exists in the realm of the subject? I hear the voice of a woman screaming and chills run up my spine, and for the first time in grad school I am alive. Some woman is on a stage screaming my thoughts, screaming for justice and I want to cry because it is so amazing, so beautiful, but I can't write that so I say that she is subverting the male gaze, that she is the Derridian Hymen

Anti-oedipalisation

Finley's performance of multiplicity synchronously engages in the act of incest with the mother embodied within the singular discursive site of the performative female body. By undermining the fixed referent of woman and presenting a multiplicity of characters channelled by her voice, Finley is disrupting the Aristotelian- oedipal notion of the unified self (subject).

In the example of First Sexual Experience, Finely is attempting to arrest her audience from its voyeuristic complacency, and inciting them to recognise the violence of language. Finley illustrates both the absurdity of Freudian psychology, and the violence of the colloquial phrase "motherfucker". The episodic framework of TCSD is used to question the 'universalising truths' such as, Freudian psychoanalysis, and the cultural ontology of the oedipal subject. Maria Pramagiorre speaks of these phenomena in Finley's performance as Finley's enactment of violence illustrating the 'absurdity' of Freudian logic.

> Finley enacts the violence and absurd logic of another metaphor; the Freudian construct that equates penis/feces/baby. According to Freud, the female child, bereft of a penis, first envies her father's penis and then, with maturation to genital sexuality, seeks to have his baby, which operates as a substitute penis. Finely performs an ironic reversal in...'First Sexual Experience'...She lends Freud's

as Dean wilcox suggests as she exists in both the position of object (she is naked) and subject (she is taking her space and power by speaking/ screaming her truth). When I see traditional theatre I want to say things like 'not another play full of linear plot lines with a climax where some chick dies cries or lies and kills herself'. Even the plays written by women are like that, but I can't really say that, that is not a valid analysis...not in those words anyway..not in that writing that is improperly punctuated.I am awake, I hear a woman screaming..it's me. I hear the voice of a woman screaming and for the first time I am awake at grad school.

Nov/12th 2002. I am in Buffalo New York, I have no place to stay, I have flown here on a desperate hunch that maybe Karen will

> metaphorical Oedipal complex a literal existence and exaggerates Freud's suggestion of infantile sexuality by locating its temporality in the womb-bound fetus. (Pramaggiore, 280).

Consequently in Finley's enactment of the absurdity of Freudian logic, language is given agency. Language is held responsible for its inherent misogyny and violence.

When discussing Finley's use of the word 'motherfucker' in her text Pramagiorre observes;

> Rather than relying upon the linguistic use of 'mother fucker' as a catchall pejorative term emptied of any relation to bodies, Finley (incites) the word literally, stripping it of its ability to hide behind its metaphorical status. Thus a London observer critic observes that 'Finley uses words like bludgeons' is particularly appropriate in context; Finley materialises words, revealing them as the weapons they can be. Finley's exaggerated use of words (expresses)... 'How metaphors are instrumental in producing particular ideological positions'. (Pramagiorre, 281)

Finley's use of words that are socially sacrosanct, is an attempt to interrogate the lack of agency within linguistic identities. As Judith Butler writes, to 'be named by the other' is traumatic. Therefore, when Finely summons the literal act of 'fucking the mother' to the stage, she is

see me. I have no appointment, no money, and merely hope that things will work out. The theatre is charmed somewhat by the fact that I am from Canada. I see the show and go for a psychic portrait with Karen. We chat and she says that my portrait is her favourite for the day. I believe her. I tell her casually that I would like to see her for an interview, sometime..perhaps when she is in calgary although my heart is sinking a bit because I want to see her now...I have just spent onethousand dollars to come and see her..to get an interview with her...and well this maxed out credit card may not have been fully realised....I am about to completely give up when she asks...
KF:"why aren't you making your own art? Why are you writing about mine?"
KN: I am making

interrogating a culture that disregards the impact of its casual slang. Finley is also calling to attention the misappropriation of oedipal identity in culture, revealing the incongruous nature and absurdity of oedipalisation within female centred philosophy. Consequently, Finley's summoning of the enactment of a baby-dildo 'fucking its own mama' creates an Anti-oedipal theatre, lending itself to a symbolic order of anarchy. By engaging in the incestuous act of 'mother fucking' on the stage Finely reveals the 'partiality of ideology' in this case the culture of patrio-capitalism that is supported psychologically and symbolically with the production of representation and the cultural ontology of oedipalisation.

Now I must ask how is the ontology of oedipalisation involved in Finley 's deconstruction of the capitalist subject? As I illustrated earlier in the first chapter, the oedipal subject is defined by 'differentiation' (Deluze and Guitari, 78). The oedipal subject understands what their role is in society, mother, son, father, and stays within the parameters of their proper identity, thereby preparing the subject for later societal subordination, i.e.: the social role of the subject under capitalism. As Deluze and Guitari note the undifferentiated subject is the subject of antipathy. When discussing the phenomenon of literatures labelled deviant or perverted, Shannon Bell observes;

The portrayal of 'incorrect', improper, oedipalisation:..denies ,

my own art. In fact I also have a show going up at the same festival your performing at in Calgary" Kf looks at me with her distrusting eyes and I answer them.
KN: "I have to finish writing about you before I can move on with my artwork, I will be haunted by you until I finish my thesis". My portrait is done, Karen slumps over in her chair, she looks like the quintessential tortured artist as she hangs thoughtfully over the edge of her chair, head down, hand on forehead (the post-modern thinker, I think to myself). I go towards my girlfriend to collect her. She asks If I got an interview I say no, we are about to leave and Karen appears...
KF; well where are you staying?
KN: we don't know.
KF: well do you have a cell number?
ME: no. (I am

> overrides, the proper identity formation of the modern subject: individuation as a process that places the child in subordination to parental authority as preparation for later subordination to societal authority. (Deluze and Guitari, in Shannon Bell).

Finley 'overrides' social delineation's of identity provided by oedipalisation, and therefore calls into question the subordination of the subject both as child and as adult. Finley achieves this by presenting an improper oedipalisation in the segment entitled Refrigerator.

In "Refrigerator "Finley questions the authority of the parent positing the child's subordination to the parent as dangerous, and careless. The mother figure is ignorant and ill equipped to care for the daughters safety, she is merely concerned with the ruin of dinner; her role is to attend to the consumptive needs of the father.

> So my daddy.. opened up the vegetable bin and takes out the carrots, the celery, the zuchinni, and cucumbers. Then he starts working on my little hole. Starts working my little hole showing me what it's like to be a mamma', he says, showing me 'what it's like to be a woman. To be loved. That's a daddy's job'.... Then I hear my mama come home. And she starts yelling at the top of her lungs. 'Whatever happened to tonight's dinner? Whatever happened to the vegetables for the dinner for tonight? You been playing with your

such a bumpkin)
KF: what time do you leave tomorrow?
KN:well I had sort of planned on the morning but I could leave later.
KF: Why don't you meet me here at noon.
Me:ok.

Karen Finley, all karen and no art makes Kristine a dull girl all karen and no art makes jr. Bad girl. I finally see her...my palms are sweating and for the first time I understand Jesse helms visceral response to her. She is gorgeous...beautif ul legs and it takes me ten minutes to stop checking out her ass on the stage. I am just a het woman, a het woman who is struck almost dumb by Karen Finley's beauty on the stage. What would this same experience be like for a man A man who is constantly taught by this culture to objectify woman, a man who is taught her image is for his

food girl? I wanted to make your daddy's favourite'. And I just cry to myself. 'Oh mama open up those eyes can't you see that I'm daddy's favourite' (Finley, 301).

The mother in the preceding segment is blind. Conversely to Oedipus' self imposed punishment of plucking out his own eyes, the mother has eyes but refuses to see. The main concern of the mother is to ensure that the consumption of the father is taken care of. The consumption of the father's favourite is the primary concern of the nuclear family in Finley's creation. The consumptive desire of the father must be fulfilled at any expense, in this case, at the expense of daughters. Therefore in Finley's performance of Refrigerator, the father and his authority are destabilised, revealing the family and the 'order of the father' as a violent breeding ground of blind consumption that destroys the world of daughters.

Finley negates the social authority of the nuclear family. In TCSD's incestuous nuclear family the daughter's preparation for 'later subordination to societal authority' is the preparation of an unacknowledged (by the family) commodity. If the economy of the nuclear family is the parallel (preparation) for the outside social structure of capitalism (Deluze and Guitari, 40), the mother is the enabler for the family economy, where daughters are the fetishised objects of fathers; in the micro- economy of the family the daughter is consumed, in preparation for

personal consumption. A man whose experience of women traditionally within western north american culture is to consume woman's image for his own sexual whimsy? For the first time Karen Finley's early work makes sense to me.For the first time I really understand what Dean wilcox was talking about in his article karen Finley's Hymen. The whole Subject object thing, smashing together in a way that I have no control over, I want an ass like that.....
How does it hit an audience when they see a naked body on the stage a naked body that is beautiful that is live and that has presence? If Helene Cixcous calls for women to write their bodies, this is that practice put onto stage.
It is dangerous to act upon any ideal, to put an idea into action.

her consumption in the macro-economy of capitalism's patriarchal social authority. Finley reveals the cultural process of oedipalisation as the preparation for the commodification of women in western capitalist culture, transgressing the desirable boundaries of differentiation provided by the nuclear family and the oedipal subject.

So far I have illustrated some of the materialist feminist paradigm that is present in Finley's TCSD. Unlike traditional artistotelean theatre Finley's TSCD presents a fragmented episodic channelling of mutiltudinous voices. TCSD presents alternative subjectivities to mainstream ideology, contextualising truth and challenging issues of gender (particularly the role of the female) simultaneously confronting social hierarchies. Finley's work also presents the empowerment of the female in territories that have been traditionally used to her oppress her, subverting language and archetypes for woman's benefit, such as reclaiming and reifying the hysterical woman.

Finley's feminist Mise en scene is provocative due to its inherent deconstruction of capitalist social order. The feminist analysis of mimesis is useful for a post-modern deconstruction of 'desirable' identities in patriarchal -capitalist representations. As the feminist analysis of Elin Diamond posits, mimetic representation produces reality as it engages in the act of representation. Therefore Finley's resistance to mimesis on the stage is a transgression in the phenomenology of the patrio-capitalist

In fact, arguably the practice of academia is in deep opposition to that, as the goal of academia is not act upon ideas but rather to talk or write about them endlessly in order to fully explore a point of logic. So then what happens when a stunning woman takes the stage armed with an understanding of academic theory and then puts it into action. What happens when a powerfully beautiful woman who is so captivating in a physical sense takes her artistic domain and combines it with critical theory chutzpah. Karen Finley is smart, gorgeous, and somehow other worldly. This is not to fetishise/yes it is/ Fetish her but rather to jump into the structure of the performative in her work. The beauty of her body is taboo, it is dangerous, both as a heterosexual man who wants to

subject, as mimesis is used in mediatised culture to simulate socially desirable identities. As Finley positions gender and its construction in the realm of illegitamacy, she eliminates the status of gender as a fixed referent, concurrently bringing into doubt the fixed referents of individualist cogito. Further, Finely locates gender and social identity as social constructions that are based within ideological and linguistic violence.

To create a theatre that deals with feminist subject matter is no longer enough to lend one's artwork to the dissemination of deviant provocation. However, to challenge gender constructions simultaneously with capitalist ideologies, positing female representation as the silent minion of cultural oppression is both provocative and political. Karen Finely is a cultural vigilante who resists and celebrates her social marginalisation as a woman, object of desire and capitalist subject. This theatre of cultural vigilantism deviates from cultural acts of normalisation as it deconstructs oedipalisation, by challenging differentiative based Freudian notions of identity. Finley oversteps what is culturally acceptable in her role as an artist, as a woman and as a theatre performer.

TCSD's destabilisation of (patriarchy's) late-capitalist cultural representation through the use of incest perversion motifs, the absence of mimesis and Aristotelian theatrical structure is a performative act of dissent. The deviant anti-oedipal mise en scene of TCSD challenges the

fetishise it and as a feminist herself who wants to occupy to realm of academic and artistic space.

"High art is not supposed to be sentimental, we hate the sentimental in high art". KF, in a conversation with me at the High Performance Rodeo Bar in Calgary. Wow I think I chit chat with Karen Finley, she has distrusting eyes always, and when I visited her in Buffalo, I was one of many little girls scrambling to write my thesis on her, she is like a cult for geeky white girls, I am the queen of the geek dynasty. Practice practice makes perfect, perfect like pies made of prises prise of women, who marry nice men, Practice. An interesting thing happens when we put academic theories into practice, suddenly ideas are threatening, these ideas are particularly

social hierarchies of language and representation, providing a calculating anarchic medium for Finley's feminist binary terrorism. The materialist feminist aesthetic combined with the anarchic mise en scene in TCSD is the vehicle for the articulation of social dissent against the field of cultural production. However, the tendency of cultural production, and culture itself is to appropriate and commodify the modalities of dissent in order to maintain social normalisation. Therefore, dissent is often assimilated, appropriated, commodified or named deviant by cultural production apparatuses and therefore not heard at all.

As I have explored in this chapter, the production of culture is informed by representation, however I propose that the simulation and commodification of desire perpetuate cultures production. Therefore, in addition to the re-ordering of the feminine symbolic, I believe that Finley's deconstruction of desire in TCSD is an attempt to defy the potential commodification of her work, herself, and her dissent. I believe that Finley deconstructs representation in conjunction with desire in order to subvert 'the field of cultural production' that Pierre Bourdieu asserts, controls the production of culture.

Although in this chapter I have attempted to outline the aesthetic, linguistic and representative methodology of Finley's cultural dissent (deconstruction), at this time I would like to explore the motif of desire in

threatening when the body is involved. The bodies of young women are akin to bombs, the more likened to traditional notions of beauty the are the more dangerous they are. The body is particularly dangerous if it is attached to somethingthat implicates the body in thought. That is if a woman is speaking or making an intelligent point while her body is exposed she is ready to be linguistically decapitated by both feminist and white male academics, although they may decapitate her merely by not acknowledging what is being said and by fetishising her body. Although after my experience at the 'learn-eds conference' (funny that it is no longer actually called thelearneds but everyone still calls it that anyway) I am

convinced that it is both men and woman who wish to fetishise the female body. Women have so internalised the agendas of patriarchal representation and the simulation of the female body in space, that in order for women to be safe from the female bodies they say they want to empower, they must destroy or erase the female form altogether. That was my experience at the Learneds, and well experiences of the broad is broadddd because there are some things you cannot erase, the visceral experience of the body and feelings are what I know. This does not mean that feelings and desire are not constructed by culture, because ofcourse that is what I am attempting to prove, however, representations of real women on the stage and off are also made impossible by the

CHAPTER THREE: DESIRE IN TCSD

The Body

In Discipline and Punish Foucault asserts that the body is the site of social correction (128). The body is contagion in its silent integration of socio-cultural encoding. It is the site of punishment and it is the site of reward. Therefore it is not surprising that in western culture the body is also the site of social taboo. The Taboos of sex, orphus fluids, fecal matters and appetite all reside in the discursive site of the body. Body taboos in western culture historically have also occupied the site of deviant desire. That is to say, repressed desire and cultural body taboos often occupy the same space, speculated to be the result of North America's puritanical roots. The body is the site of desire; therefore, the body is the vehicle for desire made manifest. It is desires corporeal breeding ground and resting-place. Therefore the body is a discursive site onto which culture is mapped/played out. Consequently the notion of body as discursive site of cultural mapping is useful in any critique of western consumer culture.

> Whether one thinks of aerobics or prozac the body is a colonised, obedient entity (Kauffman, 127)

The body as site of cultural mapping is useful for a feminist analysis of late capitalist culture. The body is where the free will dwells and awaits manifestation; it produces our (corper) reality as it maps our desire. As the

unwillingness of feminists to activate some founding principles of feminist theory (but I guess it would be cultural feminist theory) however, they bare the principles of sisterhood.It is capitalist individualism, and male patriarchal ideologies that divide us competitively and ofcourse we will not all always get along. that is not what I am suggesting, however to erase the abject female body from representative space is to erase all female body's in space. That is not to say that the female can only ever be presented in abjection, however in order to reclaim the histories of that abjection women must begin to play with the facticity of their delineation in abject representation. I believe that Finley does this in her work, and although feminist

body is inscribed by ideological corrections so too the body is mapped by cultural desire. Therefore the body as the discursive site of cultural dis-ease is integral to Finley's aesthetic provocation aimed at the ideologies and apparatuses of social control.

Because the body is mapped by culture, (the site of social colonisation), it is useful to examine what is mapped onto the site of Finley's body in the performance text of TCSD, in order to further understand Finley's feminist critique of desire. Finley begins TCSD dressed in a yellow dress. The dress is frilly and very feminine, it is not the type of dress a woman would wear around the house or wear to go out shopping, to the market, or work. This dress is marked by its special and impractical nature, reminiscent of a teenage girl's grade twelve graduation dress or prom dress. Finley is wearing the markings of 'innocent' feminine beauty; the dresses frills and bows contain her body. The signs of traditional femininity somehow alluding to the moment before that femininity is defiled by male desire map the first image presented to the audience.

The monologue that begins the piece accompanied by the image of a yellow girlish dress is Baby Bird. It is the audience's first textual introduction to Finley's subversion of desire.

> She dreams. She dreams of strangling baby birds. Bluebirds, wrens and robins. With her thumb she pushes back on their beak, against

theorists talk about the work of Finley logically, I believe it is more threaten- ing for the feminist practitioner to see Finley's cultural undoing in real time space. I will come back to this idea in a Monet. I was performing at the 'learneds' conference in Edmonton Alberta and I was doing a piece on the exclusive nature of academia. The piece itself was a performative paper reading of Finley , it involved exposing my thoughts, analysis my ti... it was a protest really, and act of dissent that usurped the my own abjection. Rule number one, in North america we are completely hung up on tits. I am sure there are many theories about this, but really everyone wants to cut them off erase them, consume them, the taboos of the body are rampant in our sexuality

their soft small neck till it snaps like a breaking twig (Finley, 293). Dreams are traditionally associated with hidden desires or the repressed desires of the Freudian 'id'. In the North American linguistic vernacular dreaming is also synonymous with desiring or wishing. For example, a person dreams of being a movie star, or a young girl dreams of her wedding day. However in this instance our dreamer dreams of violence. Immediately the text introduces inappropriate desire, or desire that seems abnormal and deviant.

Although the female that is introduced is dressed in the trappings of femininity she is the antithesis of feminine social training. An intertextual moment of 'in-betweeness' (Cixous in Case, Ed: Goodman), occurs as the girlish prom image is presented simultaneously with the volatile female dreamer. This intertextual moment sets up the strategy of representational resistance for the rest of the performative text. This strategy is,

> elliptical [and] fragmentary rather than whole. Interrupted rather than complete [where the] feminine form seems to be without sense or formal closure, it operates as an anti-closure (Case, ibid.).

The use of intertextual representation works against desire that is created by woman's image in mimetic representation. For example, females traditionally are thought to be naturally nurturing not murderous, therefore in this sequence the dreaming of a violent acts, 'strangling baby birds' is in

that is commodified and intertwined with capitalism's dissemination of what our sexuality should be. Cut off her body, save the head the women cried!
je reufeus, je reisiste, c'ontre le capitaliste. Je refuse, je resist, c'ontre le capitaliste.
The story is interrupted by madness, you see Salvador Dali said that all art is shit, that like the body culture is digested, other works of art, theories, family, social structures and after this diaspora of cultural digestion the body produces shit or art.Art is shit.The fecal matter of our world. Fecal taboo is visceral, even if fecal matter is merely symbolically represented with chocolate the cultural association and history of its taboo is actually embedded in body stimuli repsonses,such as gag reflexes.

direct resistance to traditional associations of femininity. The feminine dream world that Finley presents is in direct opposition to the delineation of 'femaleness' in traditional masculine/feminine binary identity models. The female being traditionally associated with essential identity characteristics that are gentle, nurturing and fragile. This female entity desires or dreams of what is her essential opposite, the murder of small helpless animals. To strangle and murder helpless baby birds. The text works in conjunction with the physical body of Finley in the frilly feminine yellow dress, subtle in its deferral of the traditional female form's desirability. The desire that is so easily projected onto the female body in representation is immediately deferred although not violently, but rather this deferral is subtle. What is created immediately in this offering of resistant intertextual- performativity is a dislocation in the genesis' of female imagery.

Immediately after this monologue is completed Finley sheds the yellow dress in strip tease like manner, goading her audience to objectify her. At the same time Finley sends up, in camp like fashion that she is performing the archetype of stripper, creating a distant-presence in that she is present in taking off her clothes but distant in her deliberate 'mock[ing] the conventions of the strip-tease' (Pramaggiore, 282). Finley is completely aware of the gaze upon her nude body responding to jeers from the crowd

smell associations, the history of taboo actually manifests itself within our sensory data neuropaths. What happens when the main site of cultural taboo is your own body?
VL:Your ETERNAL Rant is boring me.
KN: Tell me something I could give a flying pluck about
VL: look what you are doing in these margins here is passé. The bottom line is nobody cares what Kristine Nutting has to say. OK ! (whiney tone)you can't just say I'm Kristine Nutting and this is what I think, and blabla because I think it it's important
KN: has that all feminism has done, is that all a post-modern outlook got us, the ability to be so sophisticated that nothing matters, that everything is passe, that we are forever moving culturally at such a rapid rate of

by 'shaking her breasts in a clear allusion to the conventions of the strip-tease' (Balme, 29). Finley is appropriating the 'trappings of male domination and objectification' (Wilcox, 31).

After the strip tease Finley takes a large clear plastic bag of eggs, and smashes them in the bag on the ground so that the eggs become a broken mushy substance. Then Finley takes a child's teddy bear and uses it as a sponge to paint the egg mixture on her naked body (naked save for a pair of frilly white panties). The smashed eggs not only echo a 'code' shift from strip tease to performance art (Balme, 29) but they also resonate as a symbolic exchange for the eggs of the female reproductive system. As Dean Wilcox observes "On one level", these eggs represent,

> The institutionalised abuse of women...but on another they signify the consumption of the female body by the patriarchal economy. Using commercially produced food substances Finley mirrors the use of the signifiers of the strip-tease to present her body as an object (31-32).

The economy of male desire and its consumption of the female object are mapped onto the physical body of Finley.

Reminiscent of Carolee Schneeman, Finley's body is both the medium and the subject for her artwork. Although Finley's work is reminiscent of the feminist performance artists that have gone before her,

assimilation of dissent and simulation of desire and pastiche, that we can no longer take value in the human experience because we are too clever, clever beyond such naive issues? Because although I agree that yes culture has always been patriarchal, and at this point a feminist analysis is redundant, ***(The writer ate eggs for breakfast this morning, she thinks about the babies of chickens, and then scrambles that fetus with a fork, yum she thinks to herself)*** and although we are no longer in any state of industrial capitalism rather we are in a ever changing late capitalism that is schizoid, changing and unnameable in its ability to mutate. And although Marxist analysis is flawed and most socialism begets only more power I still believe that to merely use theory

Finley moves into new territory as she begins a rant decrying that she 'hates yellow'. Yellow is the colour of the dress she has just removed, the symbolic of feminine frills. Where the strip tease traditionally ends Finley launches into a careful banshee like articulation of anti-consumer culture sentiments. The female presence that is now naked, covered in eggs and glitter begins to explicate the ways in which she is going to riot and terrorise back the 'Mr.Entrepenuer' who is responsible for making McDonalds the symbol of her culture. Finley is deferring the desire of her naked female body as she engages in the violent articulation of her response to consumer culture. Finley's occupation of the subject stance subverts and perverts the desire of the male gaze that wants to render her body its object. Finley inhabits both the space of the desired object of the male gaze (naked stripper) while simultaneously occupying the status of a speaking subject. As Dean Wilcox observes, Finley

> Frame[s] her performance...with the signifiers of the strip-tease she lures the spectator in by appearing to portray the traditional passive objectified body, only to subvert this objectification through her verbal tirade. (Wilcox, 32)

Wreaking havoc upon the systems of binary naming and meaning Finley's representative body resides in between desire. As Dean Wilcox states "It is the role of in-betweeness" that creates the simultaneous subject/object

for the assertion , that we are too sophisticated for any sense of subject position is to miss the point of theory altogether. Why bother doing theory that is political in nature if its result is merely a social paralysis.

Inertia

At least in my opinion Why bother. Because yes we need to discuss ideas and debate, but dissent is only possible from a subject position of sorts and although that subject position may not be palatable, it must exists in order to assert change, in order to get up and make breakfast, or shit on the toilet you need to assert a subject position. Without the hope of change or movement, or at least the hope that the deviant, the schizoid, the experience that we have in these bodies in worth something, if there is no hope that these things may be celebrated, may

position which mediates desire in turn subverting the male desire that is "never satisfied" (Wilcox, 34).

Finley's body is the messy, unconfined body of hysteria. Traditionally desirable female bodies in space are contained by their female referents. That is to say, the male gaze desirable bodies are constructed for contain and oppress woman by definition. Therefore Finley's use of messy uncontainable food substances on the body, in addition to the messy and violent nature of the language, creates a body that cannot be contained by the male gaze that consumes women as fetishised objects. Finley is subverting what it means to be dirty woman (Lavey, 377). As Martha Ann Lavey observes in her Dissertaion on represenation and the female body in Performance observes,

> The figure of woman is an overdetermined site in which subjectivity is silenced and on to which (un) conscious contents are projected and inscribed. Renegotiating this cultural space is 'dirty work'.... Finley's performance of the body reasserts sex, sexuality, and gender as analytical categories in a post-modern representational discourse...in Finley's performance of the body she offers up both its facticity as a medium of experience and its metaphorical possibilities as a representative image of society. As such, Finley ...in (her) performance of the excessive and obscene body...(is)

effect change, may engage in a flow of movement, then theory, or our lives are merely yet another chink in the long chain of cultural apathy. We may say sexy words and theories at fancy dinner parties and "learned' conferences'. Conferences where we buy our Tshirts that say yes, yes I am better than you, where we buy our identities wrapped up in pretty packaged theory or nice bottles of wine to remind us that yes...we are still alive because we fucking shop. We are still human, and without hope that theory or words or actions actually are worth something to us, to each other if they are not worth anything more than mere games of ego asserting that one is smarter at the game of 'logic' than the other...than how is that different than being a CEO of a

confronting the 'gender issues of the nineties': the feminist assertion of 'images of sexuality and sex as political tools' (399).

The messy body that Finley presents cannot be contained by the meaning's attached to women in representation. Finley's body is the three dimensional medium onto which the politics of desire are mapped.

Phsychoanalysis and Patriarchal Desire

Psychoanalysis is the science by which gendered subjectivities are practised. As Maria Pramagiorre notes,

> Psychoanalysis is predicated upon a self-fulfilling process that presupposes that a particular binary configuration of gendered subjectivity and then, in analytic practice, produces these gendered subjectivities. In other words psychoanalysis a science of the self, cannot help but be implicated in and probably reinforces sexual hierarchies that are practised socially. (Pramagiorre, 275)

As I illustrated in Chapter Two, Freudian psychoanalytic theory has rendered woman in man's image. Woman therefore is a grotesque man, the symbol of castration. Accordingly because psychology portrays woman as merely a castrated male, consequently her desire is constructed in the shadow of man's. Pramagiorre observes that because the history of psychoanalysis defined women as lack,

ruthless corporation who uses child slave labour, who supports the beating of their workers, a CEO who does not believe in the impact of his work? How is the CEO's apathy different from ours? When are we responsible? Again I ask why is the notion or at least the aspiration of transcendence make our over educated skins crawl? There has to be more than theory for theories sake, because really then I don't think it is theory for theory's sake I think it becomes theory for elitism's sake which is tied to the apparatuses of apathetic capitalism...not late capitalism, not consumer culture, just mean old boring capitalism and power hierarchies that MR BUSH terrorises the world with. Yes that is what I think. Why must the one last bastion of

> Men have had the power of representation and thus the power to define women's bodies as disgusting because of either lack of a penis or woman's excessive, unrepresentable sexual desire (Pramaggiore, 275).

TCSD begins an interrogation into the systems of desire that are supported culturally by psychoanalytic theory.

The audience is immediately introduced to the motif of desire in the section entitled "Baby Bird". Baby birds are correlated with the adjectives and definitions subject to positive binary based female attributes. There are strong similarities in the essentialist entity characteristics that baby birds and 'good' female's share within definitive binary patterning. Both women who are valued as good in traditional systems of power and delicate baby birds are associated with the qualities of fragility, softness and delicacy. Positive female binary associations have long been rooted in the tradition of delicate creatures: delicate creatures who are passive and helpless by nature. However, in this segment the female emanation that Finley conjures dreams of murdering such delicate things. If baby birds are a symbolic metaphor or a direct parallel to the traditional characteristics of the 'good' woman, the desire that emerges in this dream world is violent in its opposition to the traditional systems of gentle and fragile femininity.

Not only is the character that Finley channels in this segment violent

supposed intellectual freedom fall prey to the insidious agenda's of apathy that suit only the system of over-production, the system that Deluze and Guitari call the Despotism of anti-production. Where at one time, our 'free' system of capital and production was based on need, it is now based on feigned lack. There is a difference here. As D and G state "it is only when people can be convinced that they are lacking something (anything ranging from the latest trend to national security) can they be induced to consume and produce at the ever-increasing rate the capitalist economoy requires..capital-ism has become ...a system of production ...[whose] motive force is further production of surplus-value for its own sake"(D&G 79). Capital and

towards creatures that are seemingly beautiful, delicate and helpless, the assumed feminine nature of nurturer is betrayed. The feminine qualities that are culturally believed to be intrinsic to female entity/identity such as mothering, give way to traditionally masculine characteristic of violence. The female character (for lack of a better term) initially presented in 'Baby Bird' reveals a female whose internal psyche is inappropriate and deviant, as it desires the annihilation of positive female attributes. Our dreamer is dreaming (wishing) the antithesis of feminine social training, her desire is in direct dissonance to the patriarchal models of femininity that represent woman as,

> the negative relation to man; a sign...in service to his needs and dominance. (Jeannie Forte, Ed: Bennett, 326).

It is as though Finley is presenting the dreamer as subject who is dreaming a new world, furthering Butler's theory that naming a world creates a world (Butler in Regan, Ed: Bennett, 297). In this case perhaps dreaming a world is synonymous with undoing a world, decoding patriarchal models of desire which are "buttressed by psychoanalysis" (Dolan, Ed: Goodman, 290), and re-inscribed through representation. This dream then serves as the audience's introduction in this journey of desire's undoing.

As I discussed in my second chapter desire is ideologically bound to representation, and representation is historically bound to a system of

capitalism is in complete simulation, there is no longer any capital left to represent, merely infinite over-(anti) production in a market that is saturated with 'overabundant resources', need is non-existent, but desire is infinite. The simulation of desire is what makes this system of 'despotism' work. It is a system based on lack, therefore what is the academic lacking, the theorist lacking if theory merely falls into the vacuum of over-production, of anti-production, whose main impetus is merely the reproduction of surplus-theory? Theory for its own sake. Yes theory is an art, but is also a tenuous craft that has power, that's the difference I Guess, power must be treated carefully, particularly in situations that assert they are deconstructing

hierarchical referents or what I call desirable referents, i.e.; referents that are not considered culturally as deviant, such as the desirable and good woman. As Martha Roth describes,

> women on the stage are icons of culture.... They are icons for men and examples to other women (Roth, 8).

Therefore Finley's representation of the dreaming woman is a subversion in the history of traditional female iconography, as the introductory dreaming woman is resistant to the palatable male icon; both in her presentation, (she is not mimetically represented, rather eerily articulated through a third person narrative) and in her anti-thetical interior psychology.

If it is true that 'male desire drives all narrative' as Theresa De Lauretis suggests (in Dolan, Ed; Bennett, 291) then the performance of TCSD, its text and its aesthetic, is engaged in the act of un-performing that narrative desire. However, what I am drawn to ask in response to De Lauretis' statement is what are the narratives that male desire informs? Is it truly all narratives within culture, such as the narratives of advertising, medical texts, history and the many imperceptible meta-narratives of late-capitalism? In TCSD the assertion that 'male desire drives all narratives' be they political, cultural, artistic, or ideological, (including the narrative of self for female identity making) is a motif that is revisited throughout the text. The motif of male desire and its production of cultural narrative are

power paradigms. Beaudrillard suggest that the academic is in a state of anxiety, because there is no longer any meaning left, there no longer is a relationship between work and know-ledge. No motis operandi that decries the undoing of knowledge because knowledge and meaning, are in a state of inertia. As The world of Media culture and universities 'implode' on themselves, and the culture of 'saturation' results in the destruction of meaning through simulation. The culture of Inertia is achieved through the phenomena- on of 'acceler-ation' (Beaudrillard 161). As Beaudrillard states the university is in a state a 'panic', 'this situation only appears to be new. It is so for those who still think that a real process of work takes place

visible in the section entitled "Freud" positing Freud's personal fetishes as the source of the cultural ontology of penis envy. Finley's text is subverting the construction of female desire as it is constructed by Freudian psychoanalytic theory.

> It was really Freud's problem to begin with. Really. You don't say. Yes, Rumour has it Freud had been sleeping with his daughter and sister in Law on repeated numerous occasions. I knew it. That beard and that book on cocaine.
>
> What I wanted to bring up today is that all fetuses are innately female for the first six weeks. Is that so. Then that means that perhaps the penis and scrotum are merely an exaggerated clitoris and labia?.... So maybe its womb envy instead of penis envy? Perhaps (Finley, 297- 298).

Feminine desire and feminine identity in Freudian theory locate the female and her role in culture as 'lack'. The female is relegated to forever yearn for her own penis. Her identity and course of action in life then is determined by her impractical desire. TCSD's subsection "Freud" clearly subverts the world where feminine identity is based upon the desire to posses a penis. Rather man's fear of woman's procreative ability becomes the source of female oppression, suggesting that modern culture is based on man's latent desire to posses a womb.

in the univeristy,& who invest their lived experience , their neurosis, their raison' d'être init. The exchange of signs (of knowledge, of culture) in the university, between 'teachers' & 'student' has for some time been nothing but a doubled collision of bitterness and indifference, (the indifference of signs that brings with it the disaffection of social human relations. A doubled simulacrum of a psychodrama (that of demand hot with shame, presence, oedipal exchange with pedagogical incest that strives to substitute itself for the lost exchange of work and knowledge). In this sense the university remains the site of a desperate initiation to the empty form of value" (Beaudrillard 155). theory often pretends that it is outside of ideology. At

The section entitled "Freud" also posits the institution of the family as geared towards masculine need and desire at the expense of female's vitality, at the expense of her very existence.

> Don't you enjoy women's studies classes?
>
> I certainly do. All of the books. All of the subjects. But if it ever got in the way of me being a proper hostess for Richard's business I'd give it up in minute. I'd sacrifice anything for my family. To the point of being a boring and phobic person (Finley, Ibid.).

The institution of the family is divulged as a source of oppression for the woman. Although this resonates with the sentiments of early feminism, it also reveals a feminist materialist stance where the apparatuses of the family are revealed as the producer/monitor of cultural ideologies. The family is the re-producer of cultural fields of normalisation. These fields of normalisation are imparted as 'phobic and boring', to the point of causing erasure of the female form. The family is exposed as a hostile environment where identities are sacrificed.

The castration fear that narrates female identities is betrayed. TCSD's Freud defamiliarises the social apparatuses that form female desire. Female desire and identity in psychoanalysis are created anew. The oppressive identity models of Freudianism are subverted and reclaimed in favour of the female. No longer is psychoanalysis the 'Buttress' of male

some point the theory has to stop and the physical body and experience must be worth something. If theory is merely for the ever ethereal plane of distraction, how is it any different than shopping, making bad art, stating ridiculous claims that are naive an assert that change is possible, hope is necessary? I thank all of my acting teachers for teaching me that my talent is in my tits, I thanks all of fathers for fucking me cuz it wasnt' enuff that they fuckkkkkkkkked my mama. MA Ma Mah is an acting exercise mmmm is for motherrrrr o o is for oligarchy t t is for terrorise h h is for hurting, and hitting and humping carcasses of dead girls in dead photos of dead culture in dead magazines. E, e is for every time you put me

desire; rather it becomes the methodology by which to decode the patriarchal models of the past. In this work Finley splinters Freudian psychology, revealing modern psychology as another function of patriarchal desire on the fetishised female body

The Male desire that De Lauretis articulates drives the narrative of TCSD although to a subversive effect. Finley is drawing attention to the invisible male narratives that construct the ideologies of her culture, consequently detailing the construction of female identity vis a vis male desire's a/objectification of woman.

Deviant& Perverse Desire: Simulation &Desire's Commodification

In TCSD male desire is held accountable for the perversity of its misogynist nature. Finley's subversion of oedipalisation in "Refrigerator" and her reversal of Freudian psychoanalysis in Freud provide examples of this accountability. The subversion of male desire and its uncovering as the source of perverse socialisation is a theme that runs throughout the text of TCSD. Consequently male desire in action (desire made manifest through corporeal physical action) is also repeatedly divulged as violent, perverse and infinite in its violent social re-production. The segment entitled "Paranoia" provides an example of the violence of male influenced social production.

down.
R r is for the rights, the right the write to right. Cheessy.trite. That is what I have learned from my MA maah how to say things like, this is trite, I know it is and I dont care. I'm writing it anyway. Put in me in the margins, put this down, I pu tit down. I thank al those who value that there is one way to write 'their way' because it has given me an identity, the identity of other, of deviant, of freedom. I would rather be naive than live in fear, with a sophisticated point of view. Who do I hold accountable for the desire that I be or write anything other than what I am? Writing is my process, I cannot unlearn myself. Although I have tried/tired and to an extent I have, but to pretend that writing is alien from the person, that there is a voiceless correct way to

In "Paranoia" the social impact of unequal power paradigms relegates woman to the social- role of mother or whore or rape victim.

> Let me tell you about POWER. Being gang raped be a group of youths at the age of 15 in the subway. Until they discover my secret of being born without a vagina. They throw me onto the train tracks with their embarrassment and the train rolls over me. And all my mother could say was 'see the reason God didn't give you a vagina is so that you wouldn't be violated in this way.' So I knew I couldn't be a mother or whore so the only occupation left was religion. Until I discovered that God is a man. (Finley, Ed: Martin, 298)

In "Paranoia" vaginas are revealed as the objects of male animosity. However, without the genitals to mark her female gender, the narrator may not enter culture at all. Converse to traditional representations of rape, Paranoia locates rape as the perverse result of social power paradigms. In this particular cultural vignette the absence of vaginas are God's silent blessing.

The impact of male desire in "Paranoia" is not only malevolent in its social construction of women, but it is also violent in its social coercion of young males.

Let me tell ya about obsession. Grown men force-feeding young

write is also naive no? Is not writing tied to cultural capital, Is the system of thinking not directly tied to the hierarchical systems of capital and production that a person experiences in their life? For example At fifteen I lived in a car for the summer, we picked up dead porcupines off of the road, I would sew them with my native step father and make them into earrings, then my mother would sell them at night in strip clubs in the small towns all across the prairies. IN grade four my mother kidnapped me we went to go see president Reagan so that he could stop the corruption in the judicial system in Saskatchewan. My mother was serious in her attempt and actually believed that in 1981, president Reagan could be a help to us. I read my first book at fourteen, it was a bad biography about

boy's to produce the perfect shit. The perfect size shit. The perfect smell shit. The perfect colour. In the toilet he slowly drops it the turd out. (Finley, 298)

The adult male force feeding the young boy so that he will produce fecal matter presents a vicious and cyclical form of male obsessions/desire in action. Again manifest desire is conscripted to the position of power, the scatological imagery appears as a critique on the production of culture. The male-normative socialisation of young men is paralleled to the production of fecal waste matter. The female narrator is naming the 'obsession' of material production as exclusively male. The cohearsion of social production that is being illicit in this scene is violent in its male dominant power dynamic.

In "Paranoia" production is also presented in excess. That is to say productions only function is to cohearse future generations to create more production. The 'perfect' product of the coercive production is, waste (fecal matter). Therefore, production is in excess of itself, provocatively mirroring the excesses of western consumer culture. This particular scatological image is almost pre-emtive of the late-capitalist theories of Deluze and Guitari, where consumer culture's only goal is to create lack or false need/desire, in social markets of over-abundance.

It is only when people can be convinced that they are lacking

Jim morrsison with lots of sex and drugs and rock n roll. I read only three books in my life by the time I was twenty...No really. Between the ages of fourteen and twenty, was when I read those three books that was my level of literacy. One book was a trashy romance with lots of sex and drugs, one book about a trashy rock star who had lots of sex and did lots of drugs, and the other, Fear And Loathing in Las Vegas, was about two guys who did lots of drugs but were really too stoned to have lots of sex. I was not read to as a child. I passed grade one only because a new proactive education methodology that no longer failed students in early years. When I got assignments I didn't know what to with them so I threw them in the garbage. I learned to read in grade three when I learned to

> something (anything ranging form 'the latest' fashion trend to 'national security') that they can be induced to consume and produce at the ever-increasing rate the capitalist economy requires. (Deluze and Guitari, 79)

The modern modes of production are no longer dependant upon capital and labour or supply and demand, rather it is dependent upon the production of infinite desire. Finley's vignette reveals production as the means and mode in and of itself. No longer does production require a relationship to the modes of capital and labour; it is merely coerced through the socialisation of young boys. Paranoia is particularly provocative in its comparison of potty training with the modes of production. In Finley's mise en scene production is the means in and of itself, its re-production is coerced violently by socialisation.

Finley's perverse text that is frequently scatological in nature is in fact a strategy that is used to expose the perversity of mainstream desire, or mainstream culture. The use of taboo text and the exploration of what is viewed culturally as perverse are an artistic tactic meant to enable Finley's expression of the social 'other'. Because there is anxiety in "dominant culture about the sexualised body" the "dirty bodies" in Finley's text and on her stage disrupt the "primary site where identities get constructed and patrolled" (Lynda Hart in Lavey, 377). Finley is decoding the normalised

write. I never did write not really. I was encouraged not to write because it was too messy. My writing was slanted backwards, it was illegible. Not much has changed. I was kicked out of my house at sixteen, I was arrested for trafficking drugs two months later (I was seventeen) I attended only three weeks of all of grade twelve, and when I graduated highschool I had that distinct opinion that I was a boy not a girl because women were for getting fucked. That is my cultural capital. These experiences colored what I value, colored what I was able to learn, colored what was my available cultural capital upon entering University. Now, in my mind my cultural capital is just as valuable as my jewish friend Steven's whose mother and father gave him the best

social roles of women and men, relating them as the result of a patriarchy's social distortions. Patriarchy is not a unified ideology that rests in the fault of the male, rather in these vignettes; it is handed down arbitrarily through culture and the socialisation apparatuses of gender. The gendered social roles of Patriarchy are unveiled as perverse and obsessive.

private education their money could buy. Because his Jewish community had a high respect for education he could read by the time he was Four, he was taught by his Opa. He was an avid reader as a young boy, and in the summer read- a- thons he always won. Completing eighty books bewteen the summer of grade two and three, he was given music lessons from the time he was five, he can play several instruments and name classical pieces of music and their composers. To pretend that this does not affect his writing, his education his person, to pretend that his person is somehow separate from his writing, is merely that...pretend. Finley includes the reality of her life in her works and interviews, and ofcourse who she is as a person affects how and

The Myth of Individual Desire; The Field of Cultural Production

The disruption of sexualised gender boundaries in TCSD is an intervention not only in the construction of gendered identities, but it is an interrogation in the simulative apparatuses of representation, which are buttressed by individual desire. Finley's deconstruction of phallologocentricism and its connection to desire and gender encoding are evident in the Baby Bird section of the text.

> The problem really was in the way she projected her femininity. And if she wasn't passive, well she just didn't feel desirable. And if she wasn't desirable, she didn't feel female. And if she wasn't female, well the whole world would cave in. (Finley, Ed: Martin, 294)

The speaking subject in the preceding excerpt is problematised by her inefficient representation of self. That is, the subject's problem is in the way she projects her femininity; which, if not passive enough or female enough

will become undesirable, not only to the subject herself, but to the very foundations of society as her undesirable nature will cause impending social chaos. This excerpt then leads me to question, if the Cartesian ego is based on the premise "I think therefore I am", this passage illuminates the Cartesian subject self as strictly male in nature. The female in this passage exists only in the margins of the Cartesian ego. That is, the male thinks therefore he is (subject), the female conversely is desired because she is passive and therefore she is - she exists only as the object of male desire. Not only does the male narrative of desire that Finley illustrates in this passage posses the ability to construct the females notion of her self, but it also possesses the capacity for world making apparatuses which are incumbent upon the females projection of her femininity. That is to say, if the female is not desirable, then she is not female and if she is not female the world will inevitably 'cave in'. Therefore, in this passage Finely targets female representation and its ideological conscription to male desire as the thread that holds patriarchal culture together. This passage of text suggests that if the binary divisions of gender are not performed correctly or in the females case desirably, the phallologocentric sense making and 'world making' apparatuses will collapse.

Because TCSD situates the performativity of gender as central to world making apparatuses (Baby Bird and Freud), gender performativity is

why she creates her art, although she is not creating her art souly for its autobiographical purpose. I will not pretend. I am connected to the how and why I write. Why do I want to write this paper at al? Because I believe that I am allowed to say what i really think, even if it is not proper or intellectually mature even if nobody cares what Kristine Nutting thinks. Maybe I am not interested in the false pretence of more oedipal exchange. Or worse, oedipal exchanges from professors of feminism, I can't stomach it. I believe that my 'piece' of 'product/shit/art' is valid. It is just as important as any other, it is as important as my friends steven's or anything I admire from deluze and guitari or whoever I happen to admire that day. Although our post-modern culture is the

presented as integral to the re-inscription of cultural values through representation simulation of (wo/man's) desire. Performativity itself is an act of re-inscription whose re-inscriptive function is operative in its masking of the ideological apparatuses from which it stems. As Judith Butler observes,

> Performativity is thus not a singular act, for it is always a reiteration of a norm or set of norms, and to the extent that it aquires an act like status in the present, it conceals or dissimulates the convention of which it is a repetition. (Butler, Ed: Bennett, 283)

Therefore performativity is what makes the effects of representation possible, the simulation of the hyper- real must be performed by the subject in ideology. Representation and its ensuing cultural simulations are made possible through the re-inscriptive function of normative self- performance.

The danger of course in my analysis thus far is that it does pre-suppose a uniform 'ruling class' and that the dominant ideology of that ruling class is unified and singular instead of the likely case which is, that it is composite and possessing 'internal contradictions' (Regan, Ed: Goodman, 296). However, I believe that Finley is working from the perspective that presupposes her culture to posses a dominant ideology that is phallocentric and capitalist by nature. In an interview with Richard Schechner Finley reveals that she is concerned with the effects of late

result of our loss of innocence that we will never regain, the moment we become too sophisticated to allow our own validation, the moment notions like validation leave a distaste in your mouth, you might as well pack it in.. Yes meaning is obliterated. Fine, you win, enjoy yourself, can you? I say things that are trite. Although it has been said and it is trite I believe it, our differences are totally interesting and fascinating to me.
We have been co-opted.
(gender performativity, I knew this instinctually after my first five boyfriends cheated on me, I knew that somehow their masculinity only allowed for them as young men to express moments of tenderness, and or femininity when they were copulating with women, I also knew that my own sexuality

capitalism on her immediate culture, rather than on the economic theory of capitalism itself. In a culture where "old people are disregarded" and people are no longer responsible for "what's going on in their own personal lives", Finley states,

> Female oppression is everyday, it's the anchor I have to society.... I wanted to show vignettes of capitalist consumer society where people go out, stretch the boundaries, but still they never can be satisfied (Finley in Schechner, Ed: Martin, 256).

The effects of the pre-supposed 'dominant ideology' of western culture being the degradation of human worth (particularly the females) via market ideologies whose primary concern are profit margins, and the creation and manufacturing of cultural commodity fetishisation through the manipulation of desire. Consequently Finley's deconstruction of desire's gaze on the female body raises questions about the legitimacy of autonomous desire.

Finley's dissent is in dissonance to consumer cultures commodification of desire. By rejecting mimesis (representations simulative tool) concurrently subverting and performing the desires of a 'deviant' hysterical woman. TCSD writes the desires of the female body, charting new territory for both desire and women. As Jeanie Forte observes of Cixous's feminist philosophy which agrees with Lacanian theory who asserts

was not my own, that somehow my sexuality had been co-opted to the point I didn't even know what I really thought was sexy, images of hollywood movies stars fuking were 4-ever trapped in my head, but I did not look like them, did I deserve pleasure if I deviated from their codes of femininity? The cultural simulation of my femininity whatever you want o call it. I call it experience)
Difference/difference, differ defer,differences are what fascinate me, their plurality, and from time to time I am completely struck by their magic, and that is why I bother to write anything at all, and why I am interested in the ideas of D an G and Judith Butler, and difference is the reason why I will go and chant with strangers in a room, and it is flaky! And its funny and ridiculous. I love

> It is through language that we acquire patriarchal values, but asserts therefore it is possible to dismantle patriarchy through language... a language that is rooted in the female body and female sexuality... exhort[ing] women to 'write the body' in order to speak their subjectivity... Because of the position to which women have been allocated by patriarchal language, they have the potential to generate subversion of that very language ... against the psychoanalytic model of subject construction in which desire is articulated as exclusively male, it is female desire that is most disruptive. As lack, reflecting only mans desire, women are not permitted or even conceived of as having or owning their own desire. Cixous's mandate for women is therefore to terrorise patriarchal discourse by writing from the locus of the inscription of difference. (Forte, Ed: Case, 259)

According to Cixous, women's articulation of desire is an act of cultural subversion. Culturally any desire that does not reflect the desire of patriarchal discourse will be stigmatised on a gradation of deviance as it strays away from the accepted social norm. Consequently, it is in a sense, a small act of social (gendered) anarchy for a woman to express desire that is not the normative desire of male narratives. The exponential value of anarchist impact is increased when the desire is expressed publicly,

how ridiculous bureaucracy is, the ridiculous egos in the various depts at the university, how ridiculous ralph klien is. The bodies and beings of women are not unified, nor is capitalism a unified movement, but I know that the bodies the beings the sexuality of our culture is completely co-opted by capitalism, I know that there is a new ideology that is dominant out there, it is the ideology of desire, it is free floating, it is supposedly free, Insert picture of what you want here. My life exists symbiotically with this work. It exists in conjunction, it has to because this work is about my voice, I cannot write without a voice. Why bother? Why would any one write if they were not allowed to write in their voice, how would they? And I know that I am naively believing

particularly desire that does not mimic the acceptable social performance of femininity.

Finley in TCSD is performing/writing from the 'Locus of difference' that Cixous illicits. Finley is expressing her desire to terrorise a culture that is built for 'Mr. Entrepreneur'. Therefore TCSD's, "Nothing Happened", and "Tie you Up and Steal Your BMW" actively disrupt the systems of male desire, in order to reclaim desire. Finley is terrorising the commodification of desire and the culture of object fetishisation that includes the bodies and beings of women. Consequently Finley's deviance (she is a subject speaking) de-familiarises the certainty of male centred cultural values. Finely is taking action of Cixous's call to women, to use the performative Locus of her body/difference to terrorise the patriarchy.

> So I went on a diet and nothing happened. So I became macrobiotic and nothing happenned. So I went down to Soho and checked out the art scene and nothing happened So I quit drugs and nothing happened. So I worked for the ERA and nothing happened So I put out roach motels and nothing happened So I petitioned, rioted and terrorised... and something is going to happen cause I'm not going to let you gang rape me anymore walking down my streets that I built with my soul, my creativity, my spit... (Finley, 295).

Finley warns that a new reign of terror is about to begin, she will not be

in a certain truth, but we all have to no? PerBrask always said, "what the post-modernist doesn't know is that when he falls off of a roof it still hurts". I am doomed here to work with my favourite metaphor, which allows for the certain truths of my body. TAZ, a temporary autonomous zone. something like me writing academically about deviance and then being my deviance on the same page, like me quoting from the work of Mrs. #$@@, one of the women who scorned me most at the Learneds conference. It is ironic.The learneds conference learn. I learned. Certain women from that conference wanted to learn me, but they forgot their microphone tampons, so they could not speak, instead silently punishing she who could not resist to slaughter their sacred

raped by this culture anymore, she will not let her spit, her soul her creativity be trodden upon by her own abjection. This warning is furthered when this first person narrative begins to actively terrorise the Mr. Entrepreneur figure with its own commodification, literally shoving the objects of commodity fetishisation back up Mr. Entrepreneur's (consumer culture's) own ass.

> My sweat, my music, my fashion is just another money making scheme for you. You are the reason Mr.Entrepenuer, why David's Cookie McDonalds is the symbol of my culture...So I take you Mr.Entrepenuer, Mr. Yesman and tie you up in all of your Adidas, your Calvin Klein, Your Ralph Lauren, your Anne Klein too, your Macy's, your Bloomingdale's. I tie you up in all of your fashion...I open up those designer jeans of yours. Open up your ass and stick up their sushi, nouvelle cuisine. I stick up your ass Cuisinarts, white wine, and racquetball, your cordless phones... And you look up at me worried and ask 'but where's the graffiti art' and I say 'Up your ass'. (Finley, 295)

Finley's dissent is articulated from the locus of cultural deviance; i.e., it is not culturally acceptable to aspire to shove the commodities of capitalism up its own metaphorical ass.

In "Cut Off Balls" Finley goes even further in her articulation of

cow.... as a wife has a cow as a wife has a cow as a cow has a wife.wife to the academy. It was really wonderful to see the feminist politics of so many fail so glaringly at that conference. The idea that feminists can debate with each other about their varying political stances. MMM, Dolan discusses the importance and need for this debate in the Feminist Spectator .Dolan maintains that to say feminism must be one way, is as oppressive as a patriarchal structure... END she not she but me, she criticised feminism lip service, the service of lips to to change, but those lips needed power, the power to re-inscribe the white male hierarchies of elitism in academia (though theorey maybe useful) it is not useful if the politics are never practised or supported. And if (she) a brave soul does

'deviant' desire, continuing her reign of terror on Wall Street.

> I drive down to Wall Street and break into the Exchange. I go up to all the traders and cut off their balls. They don't bleed only dollar signs come out. They don't miss their balls' cause they're too busy fucking you with everything else they've got. (Finley, 296)

The female narrator's articulation of her desire made manifest in this segment of TCSD stray's from the assumed social norms for acceptable female behaviour and desire. It also is simultaneously toying with the archetype of the rabid feminists who 'hate men'. Finley is reclaiming the reductive over-simplification of women who are angry with the social injustices provided by the history of patriarchy. "Cut Off Balls" presents a theatrical doubling in its simultaneous condemnation of the consumer culture of Wall Street that is so in humane it does not even bleed blood - just dollar bills, and its reclamation of the reductive stereotype of feminists as man-hating castrators. Finley's parody of rabid teste eating man-haters is successful in stretching the stereotype to reveal the absurd nature of the stereotype's source of anxiety. Finley uses the potential sources of her own abjection and take them to the extreme as a disruptive strategy against the culture of capitalism that names, reduces and assimilates dissent.

Finley's performance of deviance is the illustration of possibility, the possibilities for the realm outside of normalisation. As Shannon Bell

practice them., Well, when my criticism which emerged in performance, all that occurred was silence. I was strung up by my absent labia at the womens cockus... and was not spoken to by ANY women at the rest of the conference. One woman, one woman spoke to me, who said what I did was brave although she wasn't sure she liked it or agreed. How can a feminist dialogue, a feminist dialectic begin if we are all to hung up on young pairs of titties and all mighty white elitist hierarchies to actually engage in dialogue. The conference became about who could best assert what a naughty feminist I was. But there was no dialogue, no feminist dialectic. Silence, and money. You see these are the real relations between capital and theory. Although we can no longer talk

observes of Deluze and Guitari's anti-oedipal philosophy, the pervert, the marginalised, the othered subject/object, must find new territories to function in, therefore, the pervert or deviant may function outside the de-limitations of culture, carving out new territories that are perhaps multiplicitous, anti-hierarchical by nature as the pervert exists outside of order.

It is my belief that Finley's most pertinent provocation in The Constant State of Desire is her deconstruction of desire, locating desire as the constructed subject of social ideologies. Finley's exploration of desire situates personal desire outside of the infallible realm of arbitrary free will. Finley is threatening the foundations of cultural reproduction through representation, as she deconstructs the nebulous notion that desire is constructed freely and arbitrarily of the psyche's own accord.

The motif and performative function of desire in TCSD is explored with scatological and taboo text and imagery in conjunction with the messy and hysterical female body in performative space. Nothing in the schizoid world that Finley presents exists apart from the social constructions of patriarchy. That is to say, in TCSD there is no psychology, nor identity, no act of socialisation that is free from the inscription of the normative ideologies of patrio-capitalist culture. In Finley's Mise en Scene such ideologies are made strange and perverse. Consequently Finley's rendering

about a dominant ideology...it does not exist. The reality for certain women at the conference to get published was their life bread. The woman who held the power to publish demanded my erasure. Mouths, jobs and tenure track positions depended on it. My body was erased at learneds, I experienced the fetishisation of the female body and its erasure first hand. Young tits are too dangerous. Therefore the only safe woman is the one whose body is erased and whose head speaks endlessly of theory. This is not a viable option , we are both body and mind. We are afraid of ourselves.No cows are sacred to me, even though I am vegatarian.It is ok to talk the talk, but god forbid we walk the walk as feminists.But feminism is dead too. Interestingly enough, the

of a culture that is in a 'constant state of desire' reveals desire as conspiratory in post-modernities simulation of consumer culture. In TCSD desire is the silent and subtle vehicle of cultural control.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Uzma Quardri was a nice girl, a girl, a nice brown girl, in a nice white school. In the day she dreamed of being cnada's first bollywood star.. At night Uzma would go home and cook with her sisters who were slowly shipped away,

back to the 'home land',

one by one

as they grew breasts. Breasts belonged in the homeland, that's what Uzma always said and then she cackled.

One

day

after recess the nice Mrs.

Smith pulled Uzma aside along with Mr Taylor, they told uzma that she smelled, they handed her some Secret at eleven years old.

All the other nice

children like the little Anderson girl,

Ronnie Parkins, JimmY Wiebe, and

Kristine Mcdonald all knew that uzma's smell was dirty and bad, that it was ugly and gross cuz she was brown.

From then on

uzma erased her smell,

scouring and scrubbing to get that smell of browness out of her skin.

Get back in the margins young lady

women in Europe loved the piece. Because they see young breasts all the time, and therefore, they did not get lost in the fact that I was young, and partially nude. The desire to erase those bodies, that have a history of abjection stems from our own objectification and abjection of our female selves.as Gail Wiess states our history and our reclamation of that history resides in that skin, skin, abjectified body, and to simply erase that body, and all bodies that might be Perceived as attractive is merely to again erase and silence the female, to cut off her head, again and again as the head must be separated from the sexual body.Yet and still if men are not eradicating our bodies from our heads, we will do it for them under the guise of good feminist politics. we as feminists desire each

CONCLUSION

Our society is not one of spectacle, but of surveillance; under the surface of images, one invests bodies in depth; behind the great abstraction of exchange, there continues the meticulous, concrete training of useful forces; the circuits of communication are the supports of an accumulation and a centralisation of knowledge; the play of signs defines the anchorage's of power; it is not that the beautiful totality of the individual is amputated, repressed, altered by our social order, it is rather that the individual is carefully fabricated in it, according to a whole technique of forces and bodies.

(Foucault in Clark, 233).

John Clark in the Anarchist Moment defines all forms of anarchy as possessing four common elements. According to Clark anarchy is an ideal, a "non-coercive, non-authoritarian society [with] a criticism of existing society…a strategy for change involving decentralist alternatives" (Clark, 127). Karen Finley's Performance of TCSD is a disruption in fields and codes of normalised culture, a moment of anarchy in a cultural ontology of simulation and 'surveillance'. TCSD is the performative dissent of representational deviance, whose theatrical ontology provides a strategy of resistance utilising aesthetic and representational deviations to express a cultural critique that is traditionally stigmatised, assimilated and silenced.

others bodies, secretly still hating our own even though we know better. This will not be spoken of, we will simply erase and eradicate ourselves with theory/we internalise the male desire of our own bodies. The Constant state of desiring is the state of a culture that is based on a false sense of 'lack'. The state of desire's end result is the re-inscription of more false desire, in short desire creates the basis for the capitalist over production that is discussed by D&G. How do you create need when there is none? How do you control a culture that is assumed to be based on freedom? Desire. Desire is the ultimate commodity as it continually re-inscribes the ideologies of consumption under the guise of freedom of choice. 'The state does not disappear under

Integral to Finley's Performative cultural disruption is Finley's deconstruction of woman in representation. In TCSD representations of woman are ideologically suspect, linking the ontology of desire as integral to the cycle of cultural simulation. Finley's performative text unearths the apparatuses of representation, positing desire as the manufacturer of cultural values. Finley weds representation to cultural acts of normalisation; therefore, the effects of patriarchal desire and the inscription of commodity fetishism on the site of the female body are located as cultural symptoms. In TCSD 'the cultural state of desire' is the cultural symptom of patrio-capiltalsim.

Finley similar to my dissenting citizen in chapter one is 'naming' the commodification that normalises cultural misogyny. As Rob Scholles observes in the article Uncoding Mama: The Female Body As Text,

> Much of what we take to be natural is in fact cultural...the process of defamiliarisation [is] the exposing of conventions, the discovering of codes that have become so ingrained we do not notice them but believe ourselves to behold through their transparency the real itself . (Scholles, 127).

Finley's performance of provocative language, and imagery is the strategy of performative deviance. Finely attempts to de-familiarise the cultural violence that is validated by the social apparatuses of normalisation by

capitalism, even though it no longer represents a transcendent unity imposed from above: instead it becomes' immanent to the field of social forces, [it] enters into their service, and serves as a regulator of the decoded axiomatised flows." D&G, 79) I know that there no longer is one dominant ideology, I know there is no man behind the curtain. However, the one thing we all have in common in this western world is the infinance of our desire (except for Buddhists however they devote a life to taming desire). Late capitalism's lack of unity, its infinite production, based on the absorption of over - production through the creation of lack (desire) is maintained culturally through perpetual desire. its identities, and wars, are fought

Performing the perversity and absurdity of social ontology's such as oedipalisation. Finley's sexually expletive Performance utilises cultural taboos, provocative language and scatological imagery, as a transgressive strategy. Using the violent expletives of her culture, Finley attempts to name the 'real' relationships between power and ideology; exposing the control talk of her culture. Finely names power paradigms into ideology. What is traditionally viewed as culturally deviant (a woman swearing, or illustrating the literality of mother fucking) is a tool to unpack the perversity and violence of normalised cultural hegemonies.

Finding new territories to work in, Finley utilises deviations in traditional theatre aesthetic, and representation to create a theatrical 'in-betweeness' devoid of mimesis. This absence of mimesis gives her art – work a longevity that resists its immediate recuperation and assimilation by post-modern consumer culture. Consequently the resistant performative deviance she engenders not only interrogates a culture, but it simultaneously deconstructs the histories of art forms and mediums that have represented that culture.

Culture is maintained through processes of normalisation, as I discussed in chapter one. The processes of normalisation are presented to the subject who must embody normalised culture and perform that identity publicly through re-presentation of self. This performance of culture on the

not in the streets but in the billboards which are no longer transparent in their obvious attempt to regenerate the cycle of consumption. The new politico-economics system of representation, and monolithic advertising usurps difference. Creating yet another target market, we as savvy consumers live in a state that is fixed between the 'piety' and 'cynicism'. "people continue to believe in progress, lifestyle choice, the end of history whatever, when in fact there is no longer any need for beliefslanguage no longer signifies something that must be believed but indicates instead what is going to be done. Cynicism and piety are the two moments of the capitalist form of coding and de-coding and recoding".(D &G) Finley's work is said to be

discursive site of the performed self includes not only the construct of gender but also behaviour that is condoned by the ideologies considered 'normal' within cultural codes of acceptance. Therefore social apparatuses of normalisation encourage not only the acceptable codes for the performance of gender but also are influenced by the values and ideologies of cultural production. Accordingly, the most visible site of cultural 'normalisation' apparatus is the performance of gender and its integration into the site of the body. Finley's body therefore resists mimetic sexual female representation of a realist text. This body is the text, rather than part of theatrical framing device to present a believable female sexuality. Finley uses her body to de-code its cultural colonisation. Finley's' subversion of the 'object only' status of the public sexualised bodies of women, enables her critique of the body's cultural mapping. Women and their bodies in the field of cultural production are traditionally objects, however Finley is the subject in her own cultural production.

Finley's work is provocative not because it uses nudity or social taboo, but it has been received provocatively, because it utilises a controversial mise en scene, in combinations with radical politics, and representation resistant tactics. Even if the audience does not have the academic background to un-pack her artwork, the visceral immediacy of her subject/object position on the stage is captivating and difficult not to

cartoon like, perhaps ridiculous in its assertion that capitalism transforms interpersonal relationships into the territor-ialisation and re-territorialisation functions of capitalism. D andG state that 'basic social ties are knit not familialy, interpersonally or politically but by the market. " Social production and reproduction take place now via the flows of money... motives/desires are no longer conscious, they are the silent minions of desire. We are the over fed cows of despot-capitalism forever ingesting our own desires, our own beliefs fighting each other for that last bucket of big ol' re-coded shit. Like the grain fed chickens of organic yuppie fetish stores, We are the monolith corporate-fed cows of the media. secondary the presence of infinite

reflect upon.

Finley's analysis of gender and its construction through cultural representation apparatuses are a transgressive interrogation into the socio-cultural codes. Although late capitalism 'recuperates oppositional forms' (Pramamggiore, 272) Finley's performance of deviance is an attempt to express dissent that cannot so readily be assimilated into the apparatuses of commodification and simulation. Finley's deconstruction of culture in TCSD de-codes the field of cultural production. Although Bourdieu asserts that the 'field of cultural production' is the site of struggles where what is at stake is the power to control the dominant definitions of who is a writer, TCSD reveals that the field of cultural production is the site of representation. Conversely yet similarly to Bourdieu's theory, representation 'is the site of struggles where what is at stake is the definition' of what is desirable. TCSD reveals that whoever controls desire controls culture, via desire's performativity, manufactured in the silent reproductive processes of late capitalist representational simulation. The 'real' no longer exists, just the endless pursuit and re-inscriptive emulation of the hyper-real. Desire is the ultimate commodity as it re-inscribes the ideologies of patrio-capitalism under the auspicious guise of freedom of 'choice', freedom to pursue one's own desire free from cultural codification.

commodification. Recuperate this (I am giving the computer screen my middle finger). This is free flow desire of my deterritor-ialisation. as Beaudrillard says there is only the implosion of a theory/image/ lost innocence. There is only saturation and inertia,but that too is another sophisticated theory which is good as it renders the only thing left plausible to do is create some art for yourself, do a little gardening, join that organic commune you always wanted to because in 'value's last tango' (Bdrd, 155), meaning is erased. So make your own. And this too has been heard B4. R we truly doomed to eternally repeat ourselves? Then so be it, I choose to repeat the things that give me hope. In the words of Ann Magnuson in Folk Song 'what-ever makes ya happy what-ever makes you happy

The feminist theatre practitioner who is interested in redefining representations of woman, and reifying woman's re-creation through representation must address desire and how it functions as social construction. Finley's subversion of traditional forms of female desire made available to audiences is a subversion of culture itself. Finley's performance of deviance is the celebration and reclamation of the cultural 'other'. Finley is now the producer of her own culture, through the performance of a series of gender anarchies; she is her own *anarchic* medium. Devoid of naming, Finley manages a twenty-year status that has more resistance to capitalism than a can of Campbell's soup.

Multiplicitous in her theatrical ontology, Finley performs a revolution in woman's representation. But as Deluze and Guitari suggest this we creative de-

territorialisation

Will be re-t*er*ritorialised

by the cynicism of poSt-moder*n*ity.

I am so derivative.

I m so derivative

Derivative Derrida

I want my MA ma ma ma mahhhhh HA!

INERTIA

whatever gives you hooooope, even its aaaa truely Taste-Leeesss joooooke". All hail the new ideology, the new god of pop freedom... Deviance. Finley is l'anarchist jouisance, vive le Merde!#@$ We live in a constant state of unimpacting theory. Fuck theory, I'm gonna be a bitter sweet folk-star. She s ho uld have c alled it a constant state of theory A

constant state of the- awry

A state of .. I hear they make Karen Finley dolls now,

I want

one.

Appendix I

Traditional Theatre Aristotelian	Materialist Feminist Theatre
Transcendence	Transformation
Unified	Fragmented
Structure & style	Episodic
Narrative plot	Disrupted, circular
Progressive, linear conflict based climax	Resists Climax
Resolution	No closure
Character development	Characters self-reflexive
Emotional involvement	Critical detachment
Inevitability of fate	Empowerment against oppression
Evocation of fear and pity	'Astonishment and wonder'
Single voiced	Multi-voiced
Male point of view	Shifting points of view
Patriarchal ideology	Reveals partiality of ideology
Traditional elite	Challenges hierarchies
Phallic paradigm	Breaks symbolic structures
"Truth" goal	"truth" contextualised
Enacts technologies of power	Practices gestic experiments
"Subjectivity" mimics structures of male-dominant culture.	Alternative subjectivity's
Binary oppositions:	Breaks exclusivity down
self /other, masculine/feminine	Challenges artificiality of gender, race
Psychic separateness	Class divisions as constructions
	relationality

Appendix II

Excerpts from email correspondence with Karen Finley on November 18 2002.

KN: Karen when I spoke with you last you said that your work was about justice. Could you elaborate on this (referring to your work recent or past).

KF: I mean justice on various levels - first that much of my work is about getting even. It is reactionary - that if I see someone wronged or I have been wronged I give a voice to the unrecognized in my art. This is especially true in A Certain Level of Denial, or in my latest work ...I say what most people don't want to hear.

KN: Where is your work situated in the context of American theatrical tradition.

KF: I look at my work in the tradition of art and less with theatre. I don't really think about it I just do it. Although my work comes after Chris Burden, Vito Acconci, Hannah Wilke, Yoko Ono, Fluxes, Laurie Anderson, Patti Smith - I look at myself as part of that tradition.

Works Cited

Adshead – Lansdale, Janet. "Introduction to Part Seven." The Routledge Reader in Gender and Performance. Ed. Lizbeth Goodman with Jane de Gay. New York: Routledge, 1998. pp. 231 – 235.

Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." A Critical and Cultural Theory Reader. Ed. Anthony Easthope and Kate McGowan. U of Toronto Press, 1992.

Balme, Christopher. "Beyond Style: Typologies of Performance Analysis." Theatre Research International. Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 24 – 30.

Baudrillard, Jean. Simulacra and Simulation. Trans. Sheila Faria Glaser. Ann Arbor: The U of MI Press, 1994.

Bell, Shannon. "Sharpe's Perverse Aesthetic." Constitutional Forum. Vol. 12. 2001/2001. pp. 30 – 41.

Bourdieu, Pierre. The Field of Cultrual Production: Essay's on Art and Cirticism. Columbia P. NY, 1993.

Buckner, Taylor H. Deviance, Reality, and Change. New York: Random House, 1971.

Butler, Judith. Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Butler, Judith. "From: Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'." The Routledge Reader in Gender and Performance. Ed. Lizbeth Goodman with Jane de Gay. New York: Routledge, 1998. pp. 282 – 287.

Case, Sue- Ellen. Feminism and Theatre. New York: Routledge, 1988.

Case, Sue- Ellen. "Towards a New Poetics." The Routledge Reader in Gender and Performance. Ed. Lizbeth Goodman with Jane de Gay. New York: Routledge, 1998. pp. 143 – 148.

Cixous, Helene. "Sorties." A Critical and Cultural Theory Reader. Ed. Anthony Easthope and Kate McGowan. U of Toronto Press, 1992.

Clarke, John. The Anarchist Moment, Reflections of Culture, Nature and Power. Balck Rose Books, Montreal Que. 1984.

Davis, Nanette J. and Stasz, Clairice. Social Control of Deviance: A Critical Perspective. McGraw- Hill Publishing, 1990.

Debord, Guy. The Society of the Spectacle. Trans. Donald Nicholson- Smith. New York: Zone Books, 1995.

Diamond, Elin. " Mimesis, Mimicry, and the 'True – Real'." Modern Drama. Vol. 32, No. 1, 1989.

DiBenedetto, Stephen. " The Body as Fluid Dramaturgy: Live Art, Corporeality, and Perception." Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism. Vol. XVI, No. 2, 2002.

Dolan, Jill. The Feminist Spectator as Critic. Ann Arbor:: UMI Research Press, 1988.

Dolan, Jill. "The Discourse of Feminisms:The Spectator and Representations." The Routledge Reader in Gender and Performance. Ed. Lizbeth Goodman with Jane de Gay. New York: Routledge, 1998. pp. 288 – 294.

Easthope and Kate McGowan . A Critical and Cultural Theory Reader. Ed. Anthony. U of Toronto Press, 1992.

Feral, Josette. "Performance and Theatricality: The Subject Demystified." Trans. Terese Lyons. Modern Drama. Vol. 25, No. 1, 1982.

Finley, Karen. A Different Kind of Intimacy: The Collected Writings of Karen Finley, A Memoir. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 2000.

Finley, Karen. "The Constant State of Desire." A Sourcebook of Feminist Theatre and Performance: On and Beyond the Stage. Ed. Carol Martin. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Forte, Jeanie. "Realism, Narrative, and the Feminist Playwright – A Problem of Reception." Modern Drama. Vol. 32, No. 1, 1989.

Forte, Jeanie. "Women's Performance Art: Feminism and Postmodernism." The Routledge Reader in Gender and Performance. Ed. Lizbeth Goodman with Jane de Gay. New York: Routledge, 1998. pp. 236 – 240.

Forte, Jeanie. "Women's Performance Art: Feminism and Postmodernism." Performing Feminisms:Feminist Critical Theory and Theatre. Ed. Sue– Ellen Case. John Hopkins University Press, 1990.

Forte, Jeanie. Women in Performance Art: Feminism and Postmodernism. University of Washington. 1986.

Foucault, Michel. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Random House, 1977.

Holland, Eugene W. Deleuze and Guattari's Anti- Oedipus: Introduction to Schizoanalysis. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Jameson, Fredric. "Postmodernism or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism." A Critical and Cultural Theory Reader. Ed. Anthony Easthope and Kate McGowan. U of Toronto Press, 1992.

Kauffman, Linda S. Bad Girls and Sick Boys. U of California Press, 1998.

Kern, Kirsten Ann. Staging Selves: Performing Women's Personal Narratives. Dissertation: The University of Texas at Austin, 1996.

Lavey, Marth Ann. Representating The Body; An Archetypal Appraoch to The Performance Art of Rachel Rosenthal, Laurie Anderson and Karen Finley. Dissertation, NorthWestern University P. 1994.

Phelan, Peggy. Unmarked: The Politics of Performance. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Pramagiorre, Maria T. " Resisting/ Performing/ Feminity: Words, Flesh and Feminism in Karen Finley's The Constant State of Desire." Theatre Journal. Vol. 44, pp. 269 – 290. John Hopkins University Press, 1992.

Regan, Stephen. "Reception Theory, Gender and Performance." The Routledge Reader in Gender and Performance. Ed. Lizbeth Goodman with Jane de Gay. New York: Routledge, 1998. pp. 295 – 298.

Roth, Martha. "Notes Toward a Feminist Performance Aesthetic." Women and Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory. Vol. 1, No. 1, 1983.

Schneider, Rebecca. The Explicit Body in Performance. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

Scholls, Rob. "Uncoding Mama: The Female Body as Text." Semiotics and Interpretation.

Turner, Victor. Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society. London: Cornell U P, 1974.

Wallis, Mick. "Performing Sexuality in Psychic Space." The Routledge Reader in Gender and Performance. Ed. Lizbeth Goodman with Jane de Gay. New York: Routledge, 1998. pp. 259 – 262.

Weiss, Gail. Body Images: Embodiment as Intercorporeality. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Wilcox, Dean. "Karen Finley's Hymen." Theatre Research International. Vol. 22, No. 1 pp. 31 – 37.